

65
6

McKinney, Thos.

War time talk

Essays

War = Time Talks and Essays



ERRATA.



- P. 2, Contents No. 12, for "The Enlisted man" read "The Enlisted Men."
- P. 3, line 8 from bottom, for "Plates" read "Plataea."
- P. 5, title, for "in the Third Liberty Loan" read "in re the Third Liberty Loan."
- P. 8, line 8 from bottom, for "is" read "in."
- P. 9, line 6, for "explanation" read "expiation."
- P. 10, line 2, for "dawnfall" read "downfall."
- P. 10, line 17, for "Allies" read "Allied."
- P. 21, line 6 from bottom, for "exlutation" read "exultation."
- P. 22, line 18, for "deed" read "meed."
- P. 24, line 4, for "none" read "no need."
- P. 29, line 10, for "righe" read "right."
- P. 28, line 1, for "states" read "state."
- P. 42, the line below the footnote follows line 15.
- P. 42, line 13 from bottom, for "they" read "the Central Powers."
- P. 45, line 7 from bottom, for "of" read "to."
- P. 45, line 5 from bottom, for "stronge" read "strange."
- P. 49, line 2 from bottom, for "dominant" read "dominant."
- P. 50, line 9 from bottom, for "nations have" read "nation has."
- P. 54, line 12 from bottom, for "coapletion" read "completion."
- P. 58, line 5 from the bottom, for "alliterztive" read alliterative."
- P. 59, line 24, for "more than" read "almost."
- P. 60, line 15 from the bottom, for "apposition" read "opposition."
- P. 61, last line, for "paving" read "laying."
- P. 64, at the end of line 15 add "of all its citizens."
- P. 64, at the beginning of line 16 insert "Without aspersion on any man's native tongue he insisted, etc."

P. 23, line 8, for "life" read "lift"
P. 24, line 12, for "boundary" read "barriers"
P. 24, line 20 for "Bore" read "Boe"
P. 40, line 24, for "ome2" read "ome"

Foreword.

These talks and essays with their repetitions and other imperfections are printed as originally written for a record of personal interest in the struggle through which the world has just passed. Their value as a record, their only value, perhaps, would be seriously impaired by a revision on the basis of information not accessible or not at hand when they were taking form.

Vermilion, S. D.

January 22, 1919.



Contents.

1. Reception to the Selected Men. Masonic Hall, Vermilion, September 22, 1917.
2. Reception to the Selected Men. City Hall, Vermilion, October 7, 1917.
3. Four-Minute Talk. City Hall, Vermilion, April 13, 1918.
4. The New Germany. Congregational Church, Vermilion, April 11, 1918.
5. Four-Minute Talk. City Hall, Vermilion, May 10, 1918.
6. The Memorial Address. City Hall, Vermilion, May 30, 1918.
7. Four-Minute Talk. City Hall, Vermilion, June 7, 1918.
8. Four-Minute Talk. City Hall, Vermilion, July 12, 1918.
9. Our Country. July, 1918.
10. Some War Problems. July and August, 1918.
11. Four-Minute Talk. City Hall, Vermilion, August 30, 1918.
12. An Address to the Enlisted Man. Army Y. M. C. A., University Chapel, September 8, 1918.
13. Four-Minute Talk. City Hall, Vermilion, September 27, 1918.
14. Britain and the War. December, 1918.
15. Roosevelt. The Memorial Service. City Hall, Vermilion, Feb. 9, 1919.

**Spoken at the Banquet for the Soldiers on the Occasion
of Their Departure for Fort Riley, Kansas,
Ex-Governor Lee Presiding.**

September 22, 1917.

I am proud to do honor to these men who have responded to our Country's call in her hour of need. It is not given to every man nor to every generation to be a part of a struggle the issue of which determines the course of history for all future time.

The boys of '61 carried through the struggle which saved the Union and cleared away every vestige of human slavery from this continent. Their work is a part of history. They are no ordinary men. They have touched elbows with heroes. They have passed through a fiery ordeal that does not fall to the common lot. Above the head of every veteran is a halo placed there by a grateful people as a reverent homage for work done.

Young men, you are a part of a struggle more heavily freighted with human interests than any other ever staged on this planet. On its issue will depend which of two widely divergent channels the stream of history will follow to the end of time. It is a magnificent task. Go to it. Our hearts go with you. The heart of every American is with you. We envy you the splendid opportunity for service in the cause of humanity. And when you return battle-scarred and victorious we will lift our hats and hearts to you, as now we do to the veterans of '61. On your return we will recognize that by your sacrifices to save what is best and choicest in our civilization you have won a place, rightly and nobly won a place, among the world's immortals.



**The Reception to the Soldiers October 7, 1917, in the City
Hall on the Occasion of the Departure for Fort
Riley, Kan., Ex-Gov. Lee Presiding.**

Certain events stand out for landmarks in the world's history. Such was the struggle between Greece and Persia, with which we associate the battles of Marathon, Thermopylae, Salamis and Plataea. The question at issue was whether the growing civilization of Greece should be displaced by the effete and blighting civilization of Persia or whether it should continue to develop under favoring conditions into full flower and fruitage.

In that struggle, as you know, the Greeks won. The full significance of their victory can not even now be accurately estimated. That can not be done until the course of civilization shall have been

completed. Some of the richest treasures of the past, some of the finest things the human mind and hand have done in art, in architecture, in literature, in science and in philosophy have come down to us from the golden age of Greek civilization. The forces of that civilization are still at work shaping or influencing our own.

Some twelve centuries later in another great struggle Charles Martel assembled his forces in southern France on the plains of Tours and there in a fierce and terrific contest sent down to defeat the Saracens who had come north from Spain on a mission of conquest. That battle decided whether Europe was to be Mohammedan or Christian. There is no need with this audience to dwell on the momentous character of that struggle.

Another twelve centuries have passed and another great struggle is in progress. In the extent of territory covered, in the number of countries involved, in the strength and magnitude of the opposing forces this dwarfs every preceding struggle in history. There is scarcely a spot on this round earth of ours which has not been directly or indirectly affected by this war. Great issues are involved. For men do not fight for nothing. They do not pour out the hoarded wealth of years without cause. The stakes are commensurate with the sacrifices that are being made. We are too close the struggle to envisage it as whole or to catch its full meaning. But we can see clearly, and perhaps this is enough just now, that the issue of this war involves the question whether our institutions shall develop normally under the light and warmth of God's sun or whether they shall have a pale and sickly growth under the noxious shade of a rampant military terrorism, a terrorism that shrinks from no act of brutality, a terrorism whose slimy tentacles reach to the ends of the earth.

These young men are called to an active part in this great struggle; in fact, we are all called to do our best. We believe they will prove themselves worthy. Their fathers and mothers, their brothers and sisters, their wives and sweethearts, their friends and neighbors all have every confidence that they will acquit themselves with honor, adding luster to the noblest records of the nation by their valor and their sacrifices. The sympathy and support of this community, of every citizen of South Dakota, of every loyal American is with them in the great work they have to do. Not since Leonidas and his Spartan band won immortality in an attempt to stop the advancing hosts of Persia at Thermopylae has such an opportunity offered to win the undying gratitude of oncoming generations. May these men be full of courage as they go forward and may they see the speedy and complete accomplishment of their great task.

Four-Minute Talk

April 13, 1918, in the Third Liberty Loan

Our soldiers are at the front in France. And just now that western line is the hottest place outside Gehenna. The Germans are fighting three hundred guns and twelve thousand men to the mile and by sheer weight of steel and numbers are pushing our forces backward toward the sea.

Our men must have re-enforcements and guns and munitions and supplies. We ought now to have two million fighting men on the western line. We are recreant to our duty if we do not place them there at the earliest moment.

Munitions and supplies cost money, ships to carry them across the sea are expensive. To support our men the Government must have money and we must back our Government by buying bonds. These bonds give four and one-fourth per cent interest, payable semi-annually with the repayment of the principal in ten years, a good investment.

If we do not buy bonds and the war goes by default, then Germany will collect as an indemnity many times the amount of the bonds. Germany pays no interest and she keeps the principal.

We planned to spend \$19,000,000,000 the first year. The second year may cost twice that amount. To win a war is costly but it is far less expensive than to lose it. Belgium was forced to pay in 1914 \$7,000,000 a month, this on top of a \$75,000,000 fine. Russia has just ceded 300,000 square miles of territory and 32,000,000 population. Germany is counting on indemnities from us to pay expenses for the war. We shall disappoint her. Billions for the war but not one cent for tribute to the Hun.

Let us avoid peace talk as we would the pestilence. Peace talk weakens the will to win. Without the will to win the war is lost. But we will win the war, whatever the cost. Bonds are necessary to the winning. Therefore, let us buy bonds.



*The New Germany

[For a few minutes I wish to speak, with your permission and forbearance, on the New Germany. Incidentally some things may suggest that the Liberty bond is a good investment.

It is always interesting and usually instructive when a people lays

*This talk was prepared for a union meeting at the Congregational Church, April 14, 1918, in the interests of the Third Liberty Loan. As there were several speakers the bracketed parts of the address were omitted, being replaced by two or three improvised introductory sentences. The substance of the brackets appears in the Memorial Address.

its soul bare to the gaze of the whole world. Every passerby who chooses may read the real secrets of the life of that people. And a people must bare its soul to the world, whether it wills it or not, when it begins aggressive war.

Place, if you please, the soul of the people of Germany on this desk in the clear light where all may see. Then recall, for example, the invasion of Belgium, the burning and pillaging of towns and cities, the destruction of churches, schools and universities, the ravishing and murder of women, the maiming and mutilating and killing of children, the wholesale slaughter of the aged, sick and helpless and other non-combatants, the deportation of the men, the deportation and the worse than enslavement of the young women, the lies and slanders sent out as excuses for these outrages. Then look at the soul on the desk. These things happened to the Belgians because in this soul, as you plainly see, is murder and arson and plunder and lying and lust and cruelty and baseness. These striking features of this soul you can see with the naked eye from the furthest parts of this room.

Thousands of men and women on legitimate business or missions of mercy have been sent down into the waters of the sea there to struggle for life without hope. Mingled with their cries often were those of children, even of babes, held by an unpitied fate. I need not recount the story of the *Lusitania*, the *Arabic*, the *Sussex* and all the ghastly work of the submarine. Now look on this soul. These things occurred because of this organ of the soul as you see, labelled "murder" and because of this other sinister development very like the first. The latter is labelled, as you see, "*Spurlos Versenkt*." These outrages on the sea occurred because there was and is in the soul of the people of Germany "murder" and "*Spurlos Versenkt*."

The Russian government recently met the Germans in a peace conference on the basis of no indemnities and no alienation of territory. The Russians now find that these soft phrases mean large indemnities and all the territory the Germans can get away with, seeing that the Russian army has disbanded. Already Russia has surrendered 300,000 square miles and 22,000,000 population. This amazing situation is due, as you see, to this large lump on the soul, marked "scrap of paper." These smaller lumps near are, as you have already recognized, lying deceit, hypocrisy, baseness, lust for power.]

After all how did it happen that the soul of the people of Germany developed into this horrid and repulsive thing you see on the desk before us? The answer to this question is: This thing was wrought by a Prussianized education. For forty years this system was worked under forced draft with day and night shifts to prepare the soul of the people of Germany for this war. You see the result. This system used the pulpit, the press, the litterati, the public orator, the organized energies of business and government. A religion and a Kultur were taught at variance with the highest principles of civilization. Nietzsche, Treitschke, Bernhardi are of the priesthood of this cult. In this system the state is everything, the individual nothing;

the God of all the Universe, whom we all reverence and adore, is reduced to a tribal god, a German war-god, who blesses the German people and curses their enemies. To this god the Kaiser continually appeals, and the god replies after the approved Old Testament fashion of heathen or pagan gods. This German god kindly looks after German affairs and the universe when Wilhelm is unavoidably occupied with other duties.

Right is based on might and expediency, and not on truth and justice. Germany is entitled to take possession of a neighboring nation's territory if she has the power and because she has it. She may take it now because it is expedient or she may refrain from taking now from considerations of expediency. The most solemn covenants between nations hold only during the convenience of either party and may be broken without notice. The ennobling doctrine of the brotherhood of man has been replaced by hymns of hate or their equivalent. The law of love, i. e., Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, and thy neighbor—the law of love, says Bernhardi, has no claim to significance for the relations of one country to another. So Germany may plot the partitioning of a neighbor with whom she is at peace and say how much is to go to Mexico and how much to Japan. Thus fundamental tenets of Christian civilization have been repudiated or modified hopelessly beyond recognition. All this has been subtly but most thoroughly done, much by deftly reading new meanings into old terms and phrases.

In all that has been said there is no reference, save to the people in Germany. It is not implied that every individual German there has been wholly remade by this Prussianized education, but only the dominant majority which by the fact of its dominance has the right to be called the people of Germany, and the proof of the completeness of this transformation has stood before the eyes of the astounded world from the moment the Hun bared his soul in war.

All this is not a dream, either of the day or the pipe variety. It is not declamation; it is not denunciation. It is a simple statement of some cold hard facts which have been jammed into our faces by the war and with which we have no choice but to deal. Of the many sources of direct confirmation I confine myself to one, the statement of a naturalized American citizen of German birth and education. He says:

"I do not apologize for—nor am I ashamed of—my German birth. But I am ashamed—bitterly and grievously ashamed—of the Germany which stands convicted before the high tribunal of the world's public opinion of having planned and willed the war; of the revolting deeds committed in Belgium and northern France; of the infamy of the Lusitania murders; of the innumerable violations of the Hague conventions and the law of nations; of abominable and perfidious plottings in friendly countries and shameless abuse of their hospitality; of crime heaped upon crime in hideous defiance of the laws of God and man.

"I cherished the memories of my youth, but these very memories make me cry out in pain and wrath against those who have befouled the spiritual soil of the old Germany in which they were rooted.

"I revere the high ideals and fine traditions of that old Germany and the time-honored conceptions of right conduct which my parents and the teachers of my early youth bade me treasure throughout life, but all the more burning is my resentment, all the more deeply grounded is my hostility against the Prussian caste which trampled those ideals, traditions and conceptions into the dust."

Lest he may not have made himself wholly clear he returns to the point thus: "There are some of you probably, who still find it hard to believe that the Germany you knew can be guilty of the crimes which have made it an outlaw among the nations. But you do not know modern Germany. Unless you have been there in the last twenty-five years, not once or twice, but at regular intervals; unless you have looked below the glittering surface of the marvellous material progress; unless you have watched and followed the appalling transformation of German mentality and morality under the nefarious and puissant influence of the priesthood of power-worship, you do not know the Germany of this day and generation.

"It is not the Germany of old, the land of affectionate remembrance. It is not the Germany which men now of middle age or over knew in their youth.

"The Germany which brought upon the world the immeasurable disaster of this war, and at whose monstrous deeds and doctrines the civilized nations of the world stand aghast, started into definite being less than thirty years ago. I can almost lay my finger upon the date and circumstances of its ill-omened advent."

This quotation confirms substantially every statement I have made on the case.

It is the new Germany with which we are at war. It is the new Germany which long sought to have her "Law of Necessity" made a part of International law that she might have a specious excuse for her frightfulness and other abominations on sea and land. It is the new Germany which in 1913 passed the "Dual Citizenship Law" enabling her people to swear allegiance to a new government and forswear allegiance to the Fatherland without actually giving up that allegiance. This law stamps suspicion on every German naturalized here or elsewhere since 1913. Our Government should refuse to naturalize a single German immigrant while that law stands unpealed. This, not only is self-protection, but as a protection to the good name of loyal and patriotic Americans of German birth naturalized here prior to the passage of that law.

It is the new Germany which at the outbreak of the war mobilized her Professorial Landsturm to devise and spread abroad more or less plausible excuses for her crimes and outrages, to prove that black is white and white is black, to render difficult or impossible any distinction between good and evil or right and wrong. Some of Ger-

many's crimes may in the future, perhaps, be pardoned. (I do not like to place arbitrary limitations on Divine mercy, besides, it is an infringement on the right of the preachers, anyway) but for turning her professors loose on a helpless and indulgent neutral world, the servile pack of sycophants, to fill the press with their deceptions and mystifications, for this evil thing Germany did I see no explanation at all. Possibly, in the future, long after the labors of Sisyphus have been completed something may happen, however, to let Germany head up out of Purgatory toward the light.

It is the new Germany, which by means of leagues and alliances and propaganda and other more or less hidden and subtle devices, is trying to foist her (damned) Prussianized education on this country. And her school system merits attention. For with the suicide of German school children increasing at a rate which just before the war was described as "uncanny" there is certainly something damnable in the administration of the educational system in Germany.

It is the new Germany which is going to give us the completest licking a nation ever got unless we wake up and put forth every iota of strength we possess to prevent and she is planning to penalize us for entering the war as no nation in recent times has been penalized. The territory she may claim has not been announced, only the shares of Mexico and Japan, but her indemnities will be enormous, certainly enough to pay her war expenses and to put her business enterprises on their feet again. What does wheat at two dollars or even at five a bushel, or pigs at sixteen or twenty a hundred profit a man if Germany is to take it all in indemnities? I am not a business man, but to me Liberty Bonds look better than that.

It is said sometimes that we are not at war with the German people. Let us cut out all that sob stuff and square off and fight like men and to a finish. Of course we are not at war with the old Germany, but if we are not now at war with the people of the new Germany, in Heaven's name, what is all this fuss about? God knows it looks enough like war with the German people to our soldiers facing two millions of them along the western front.

It is with the people of the new Germany we must ultimately make peace as victors or vanquished. Let us bear in mind against that day that it took at least forty years of the most strenuous effort to prepare the soul of the people of Germany for this war; that a much longer and more strenuous effort will be required to bring that soul back to a normal state and to fit it for the ways and duties of peace. Let us keep in mind the obvious thing that the fiber of the soul of a people is not transformed by a few brave and eloquent words, a thing we are so prone to forget, particularly when we are mellowed and overwhelmed with a sense of our own magnanimity.

Friends, I have spoken earnestly, indeed, but without passion; I have spoken earnestly because the old rocking chair is so comfortable and a little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to sleep are so satisfying to the soul.

Four-Minute Talk

City Hall Vermilion, May 10, 1918

World-power or downfall was the cry of German leaders before the War. World-power or downfall is still the slogan with which the German people are stirred to yet greater sacrifices. The German government means to secure a place in the sun from which it can dominate the nations of the earth. Already Belgium, Serbia, Roumania and Russia have felt the heel of the conqueror. The Germans believe that with time to organize Russian resources and man-power they can defy the civilized world and finally dictate the terms of peace. World-power and world-dominion for Germany means for us, as for other nations, that we give up rights and privileges which make us a free and independent people. These rights and privileges we will not surrender.

Beware of peace drives. Peace drives preceded the ruthless submarine warfare, the great Russian debacle, the collapse of the Italian line, and the fierce attack and near Waterloo for the Allies on the western front in March. A peace drive is on now to divert attention from an impending attack on the Allies Armies. These peace drives are a regular part of the German war program to paralyze any proper preparation on the part of the Allies.

Let no one be deceived or relax effort. We must keep up the fighting strength of the Allied line. We must give Germany no leisure for the reorganization of conquered territories and their resources. The fighting must go on and more fiercely than ever. We have five hundred thousand men on or near the line now. We must be ready to put five million men there if necessary.

In this struggle the sick and wounded must be cared for. It rests on us to assist the Red Cross all we can. It is for us to help the noble women who are providing for the injured and disabled and seeing that they receive proper attention. Let us encourage them in a substantial way in their brave and unselfish work. They are helping to win the War. And we must and will win.



Memorial Address*

Vermilion, May 30, 1918

I.

INTRODUCTION—THE CIVIL WAR.

The custom of honoring the departed is older than civilization. Before the Christian era in widely separated regions of the earth there was held every year a feast for the departed, the so-called Feast of

*Published in the Dakota Republican, June 6, 1918.

the Dead, where the dead came back each to his own household and there partook of a feast prepared for him. It was a reverent, a sacred and, in thought, a beautiful memorial to the dead, a touching testimonial that they still lived in the hearts of kindred and friends left behind.

In Athens in her days of greatest power and influence, in accordance with a legal enactment, an oration was pronounced every year in time of war in memory of those who had fallen in battle. The funeral oration of Pericles, judged by the report or fragment which has come down to us, stands, perhaps, as one of the nobler examples of human thought and speech.

It is then in accordance with an ancient custom, well established, and a law deeply graven in the human heart that a day has been set apart to honor our dead, to consider the heritage they have bequeathed, to clear our vision and quicken our sense of duty, to purify and enoble our conceptions of life, to seek out earnestly and soberly what elements in our government and our civilization are contributing most to our progress and that of the race and are to contribute most to the progress of the generations to follow, to scan the horizon somewhat closely to see if there be signs of impending storm and danger. It is doubly fitting in these days of trial and sacrifice, of anxiety and heart searching when what men have most esteemed in government and civilization seems about to be overthrown or destroyed. In added solemnity to this occasion the Chief Magistrate of the United States has called upon all citizens of whatever creed or faith to make this a day of prayer and supplication that we may carry through worthily the great struggle for humanity and civilization in which we are engaged.

Our forefathers founded on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to equality. The Civil War was fought to determine whether and in what measure that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated possessed stability and permanence. All members of the Grand Army offered—and many thousands gave—the soldier's last full measure of devotion that that nation might endure. They sealed by their sacrifices and their blood, and let us hope they have sealed forever, our fundamental propositions with respect to liberty and equality and the source of the just powers of government in the consent of the governed.

So fully and perfectly was their work done, so thoroughly was the question before them settled, that for more than half a century no voice from within the nation has been raised against their decision. With but a brief interruption the land has dwelt in the midst of peace and has experienced a material prosperity without counterpart in the world's history. It has shown unparalleled interest in the cause of education and enlightenment and has cultivated with zeal the arts which add so much to the comfort and refinement of life and so richly

to its value. It has been contributing in many ways its full share to the cause of righteousness in the world and to the advancement of civilization. We are accustomed to attribute this remarkable progress in large measure to the open door of opportunity afforded by our principle of liberty and equality and to the sense of responsibility resting on every citizen because ours is a government by the people for the people.

II.

THE WORLD WAR.

What are the dangers from without? What is the bearing of the World War? We have drifted so gently into the conflict that we seem to have been but dallying with the God of War. But now the real challenge has come along the western front. It has come like the whirlwind and the earthquake. It would topple over or swallow up everything hands have reared—before our dazed senses realize that destruction is upon us. What does the War mean for a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to equality? What does it mean for that righteousness which exalteth a nation?

To answer these questions we must examine the issues involved and the aims and methods of those who precipitated this struggle.

Germany is ruled by an autocracy. This autocracy is composed of the Emperor and the reigning sovereigns of the several states of the empire. These reign and rule by Divine right. They rule through a diet or parliament, the upper house of which they control absolutely. Against the upper house, the lower house, composed of representatives of the people is powerless. So helpless is it that to one indignant member it was simply "a hall of echoes." The autocracy is supported by the Junker element and the army. Through the army the control of the people is absolute.

The German government is the antithesis of our own. In ours the power derives from the people, in Germany from the autocracy. In our land the people rule; in Germany they are ruled. The claim that the German government closely resembles our own in the reversal of the truth. The likeness is superficial, the difference radical and fundamental.

It is these two conceptions of government, the one deriving its power from the autocracy, the other from the consent of the governed, which are now at war on European battlefields. Though there have been many subordinate issues and much to obscure and confuse the main issue, the fact is these two conceptions of government have been battling since the fateful first of August, 1914. The nature of this conflict so big with destiny was early perceived by many Americans, but only recently have our countrymen as a whole seemed to grasp its real significance. This statement of the main issue is not intended to deny that with the two types of government are associated two distinguishable types of civilization.

James Gordon Bennett, owner of the New York Herald, who

passed away a few days ago, is credited with the remark made just after battle of the Marne that apparently "the leaders imagine the war to be one of purely political ambitions whereas it was really to be a great conflict between the forces of freedom, unorganized but liberal, and an autocracy which sought to impose absolute tyranny upon the world."

For a long time preceding the War the coming struggle had phrased itself to the autocracy as World-Power or Downfall. The meaning of World-Power is made clear by a German writer in these words: "If we are asked whether we wish to establish a World-Power towering so far above the other World Powers that it is in reality the only World Power, then the answer is that the will to World-Power is immeasurable. Less even than a Great Power can a World-Power ever be satisfied."

III.

AUTOCRACY AND WORLD DOMINION.

The inevitable antagonism of autocratic government and government by the consent of the governed was perceived long ago by the autocracy. The Holy Alliance recognized it. The Prussian autocracy as it grew into power made itself the heir of the Holy Alliance and the champion of government by Divine right. It laid plans to seize and hold the supremacy for autocratic government. Through a long period these plans were developing and maturing until now they are frightful in their extent and complexity, covering practically the habitable earth.

These plans were based on a Central European empire extending from the North Sea to Constantinople, thus involving the control of the Balkan Peninsula.

By securing the Turk nominally as an ally but really as a vassal this empire was to reach to the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean. Portions of Russian territory were to be organized as minor independent states under the protection and tutelage of Germany and Austria, substantially the territory now in their possession. Belgium and Northern France were to be incorporated into this empire. Germany would thus come into possession of valuable coal mines and the richest deposits of iron ore in Europe, including those of Lorraine, and the second richest in the world. France would consequently be reduced to a condition of economic dependence and become a nonentity in the international world.

The Turk was to be invited to recover Egypt and to control the Suez canal. This done India was to be wrested from England. Her colonies were to be induced to throw off the relations to the mother country and to be brought within the sphere of German influence. With the crushing of England, Canada would become a Germany colony on our northern border. Mexico was to assume the role of an ally. The United States was expected to walk gracefully into line with

Canada on the north and our Germanized neighbor, Mexico, on the south.

A German colony is already in Brazil awaiting word for the struggle through which leadership in South America is to pass from the Latin to the Teuton. With these things accomplished the Monroe doctrine and the Panama canal must be handed over to the keeping of Germany.

A station, Kiaochau, was seized in China sometime ago so that at an opportune moment the untold natural resources of that country might be exploited for Teutonic benefit. Perceiving that the almondeye of the Nipponnese was glued to that station and feeling somewhat uncomfortable under its steady glare, Germany, with an altruism as lofty as wonderful, typical of her diplomacy, suggested to Japan that America was her real enemy and to America that Japan had evil designs against her. Then at this suggestion up and down over this broad land highbrows on the platform and in the public press were working themselves into a frenzy over the imminence of the irrepressible conflict between America and Japan. But at the outbreak of the War Japan took possession of Kiaochau and gave notice that Germany was relieved from all further duties connected with the exploitation of China. And the imminence of the irrepressible conflict between America and Japan has apparently disappeared in the heavy mists which overhang the future.

The plans of Germany respecting Africa are so well known that we need only refer to them here.

Thus we see the comprehensive character of German ambitions and German world politics. It is no part of our present purpose to point out how much of this program Germany hoped, when she forced the War, to realize at its conclusion, possibly, only a modest part of it, simply enough to make the rest of it an assured thing in a reasonable short time. Before the War Germans predicted that South America would be brought under Teutonic control by the middle of the present century. This may give some indication of the energy with which Germany was expected at that time to push her plans.

Lest it be felt that these statements respecting the purposes of the German autocracy are overdrawn, from the many possible sources I add some remarks from one of our most eminent and sober authorities on Diplomacy and International Law: "These are not the dreams of visionaries," he says, referring to the plans just summarized, "They are actual plans, worked out in great detail, on record and proved beyond the possibility of a doubt as the ultimate aims of the controlling forces of Germany."

With these plans realized what place is there in the world for a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to equality? Who may say that those who gave their lives that this nation might live did not die in vain? The success of the Germans in this war means that the United States must step down into the ranks of third or fourth rate powers and surrender rights and prerogatives which make her a free

and independent nation. The European War, whatever it may not be, is certainly a direct challenge to our fundamental propositions regarding liberty and equality and the source of the powers of government in the consent of the governed.

IV.

AUTOCRACY AND PROPAGANDA.

Part of the mighty task assumed by the German autocracy is assigned to the armed forces of the empire. Another part, and the more dangerous to the world, is given over to German propaganda. This was expected to stir up revolt in Egypt and India, rebellion in Ireland and to alienate her colonies from England. It was expected to undermine Russia and did. It would be strong enough, it was hoped, to hold the United States quiescent while these world transformations were in progress; but, if not, more persuasive and compelling means were to be employed; Mexico, Japan, for example.

We may see clearly the value attached to propaganda by these somewhat guarded as well as unguarded remarks of Bernhardt in his book "Germany and the Next War:" "The further duty of supporting the Germans in foreign countries in their struggle for existence and of thus keeping them loyal to their nationality is one from which, in our direct interests, we can not withdraw. The isolated groups of Germans abroad greatly benefit our trade. * * * but they may also be useful to us politically as we find in America." What an exhibition of international comity. How gladly nations will receive into their midst a group of loyal Germans whose business is so to interfere with the policy of that nation as to be useful to the German autocracy.

Apparently in support of this observation by Bernhardt the dual citizenship law was passed in July, 1913, only two years after the lines just quoted were penned. This law permits a German to swear allegiance to a new government and to forswear allegiance to the Fatherland and without actually giving up that allegiance.

What baser or more dangerous method can be conceived to undermine the loyalty of naturalized citizens to their government? What better method is there for directing suspicion and recrimination against naturalized Germans in every land and thereby producing a line of cleavage in the citizenry and the life of a nation? France replied with a law authorizing the revocation at will of citizenship judicially granted. This government should revoke the citizenship papers of every German naturalized in this country since July, 1913, and refuse absolutely to grant citizenship to a single German until Germany repeals the law in question. This should be done not only to protect the nation, a sufficient reason for such action, but also to shield from suspicion naturalized Germans who with honorable intent have become our citizens.

Bernhardt, however, was not the first to direct attention to America. I quote from a German writing some years earlier: "It is there-

fore the duty of everyone who loves the German language to see that the future language spoken in America shall be German. It is of the highest importance to keep up the German language in America, to establish German universities, improve schools, introduce German newspapers, and to see that at American universities German professors are more capable than their English-speaking colleagues and make their influence felt unmistakably on thought, science, art and literature. If Germans bear this in mind and help accordingly, the goal will eventually be reached."

How nicely the dual citizenship law dovetails into all this missionary activity on behalf of the benighted Americans.

1.

The Moral Character of the German People as Disclosed by the War.

Let us leave aside for a moment the dangers of espionage and political intrigue and study the German people, noting how the moral teachings of the autocracy have affected them. We may thus the better estimate the value of these teachings for ourselves.

It is always interesting and usually instructive when a people lays its soul bare to the gaze of the whole world. Every passerby who chooses may read the real secrets of the life of that people. And a people must lay its soul bare to the world whether it will or not when it begins aggressive war.

Now recall the invasion of Belgium, the burning and pillaging of towns and cities, the destruction of churches, schools and universities, the ravishing and murder of women, the maiming and mutilating and killing of children, the wholesale slaughter of the sick, the aged and the helpless and other non-combatants, the deportation and enslavement of the men, the deportation and worse than enslavement of the young women, the lies and slanders sent out against this people as excuses for these outrages.

Reflect on the fact that hundreds of men and women on legitimate business or missions of mercy have been sent down beneath the waters of the sea without warning. Mingled with their cries of despair often were those of children, even of babes held by an unpitiful fate. I need not recount the story of the *Lusitania*, the *Sussex* and the *Arabic* and all the ghastly work of the submarine.

Consider that the Russian government recently met the Germans in a peace conference on the basis of no indemnities and no alienation of territory. The Russians now find that these soft phrases mean large indemnities and all the territory the Germans can get away with, seeing that the Russian army has disbanded.

How are we to explain these atrocities and outrages and this beastliness in Belgium, these horrors and tragedies of the sea, this perfidy in dealing with the Russian foe? These things occurred because there was and is in the soul of the people of Germany murder and arson and plunder and lying and lust and hate and cruelty and

baseness and those queer growths or developments known as "Scrap of Paper" and "Spurlos Verseuht." The manifestations of these qualities of soul are not the result, as is normally the case in war, of sudden and great temptation or violent passion. These have been worked into the very fiber of the soul and under the circumstances of their manifestations are held by the German people as great and lustrous virtues.

Had the people of Germany not bared its soul in war these things we have just referred to would be simply unbelievable. It would be easier to disbelieve the most competent and impartial witness were it not for the overwhelming evidence furnished by the conflict of the last four years.

How came the German people into this condition of soul?

2.

A PRUSSIANIZED EDUCATION: ITS MORAL TEACHINGS; ITS PHILOSOPHY OF STATE.

The answer is: A Prussianized education. This education was wrought not only through the schools but also through the press, the pulpit and the platform. The litterati and the scholars were enlisted. These forces developed and taught a religion and a philosophy of state especially adapted to the needs and ambitions of autocratic government. In this system power of might makes right. The state, the autocracy being the state, is the highest expression of power in the nation. Whatever the state does or directs, therefore, is right. The German emperor said, and his Chancellor agreed, according to Ambassador Gerard, that there is no international law. This means simply that there is no power able to enforce it against Germany. And a decent respect for the opinions of mankind does not exist with the autocracy.

It is the duty of the state to increase its power. It may at an opportune moment take possession of its neighbor's territory, or it may refrain from taking if the moment is inopportune. In armed conflict the ordinary rules of war cease to be binding when they would hinder the attainment of the object in view. This is the so-called law of necessity. It justifies the abuse of the white flag, the misuse of Red Cross privileges, the poisoning of wells, the sinking of neutral merchantmen and their passengers, the bombardment of unfortified towns, the bombing of hospitals and the sinking of hospital ships. It is the basis of German Schrecklichkeit, or frightfulness. It was justifiable, under this principle, to ravage and outrage Belgium because this terrorism and beastliness were necessary to the attainment of the object of the War.

Along with this exaltation of might into right ran a glorification of war. Much of this power—worship and war—fetish traces to Nietzsche who reached such supreme heights in the upper ethereal

regions of philosophy that to him "Jesus of Nazareth was a most interesting decadent."

Bernhardi, one of the frankest of their barbarian teachers, says that: "Christian morality is, indeed, based on the law of love. But this law has no significance for the relations of one state to another." How different from our conception that Christian morality is world-wide in its application. He further affirms that "the state alone gives the individual the highest degree of life. Any action in favor of collective humanity outside the limits of the state and nationality is impossible." How circumscribed in this theory is the brotherhood of man. It is limited to the state or nation.

We have seen how the conception of right has been divorced from those of truth and justice and based on that of might; how the law of necessity, known to our courts, has been distorted into a law of convenience to cover all sorts of abominations from the maiming and murdering of children to the use of women with their babes as a hostage against the fire of the enemy; how Christian morality has been shorn of its universal attribute and made to assume a provincial or tribal character.

This theory of the state and of morals is a theory for pirates, for pirates and highbinders. Nevertheless it is the theory which for more than forty years has been worked into the mental and moral structure of the younger generations of the German people. These generations are absolutely devoted to their government and firmly convinced of the truth and value of these doctrines. We know, the whole world knows, the effect of this training. For the soul of these generations molded and shaped into conformity with these doctrines has been laid bare in this war; and we know how horrid and repulsive that soul is.

It is not at all certain that these doctrines of morals and state developed for application against the peoples of other nations and for international relations have not made themselves felt in an evil way at home. Taking roughly the first decennial period in this century and reducing to a basis of equal populations the convictions for crime against the person in Germany was more than 50 to 1 as compared with England and Wales; those against property 25 to 1; illegitimate births 3 to 1; divorce petitions 6 to 1. The suicide of German school children was increasing at a rate described before the European War as "uncanny." Among children from 10 years to 14 in Bavaria the suicide rate was 3 to 1; in Saxony 8 to 1, compared with the registration area of the United States; in Berlin 15 to 1 compared with New York City. For the five-year period ending in 1913, the rate of adult suicides in Berlin was more than twice that of New York City, and more than three times that of London. Crime and pauperism in Germany have been increasing at an alarming rate.

To realize yet more clearly the situation let us recall the words of a distinguished American of German birth and education. He says: "Less than thirty years ago a 'new course' was flamboyantly pro-

claimed by those in authority and the terms 'new course' became the order of the day. With it there came upon the German people a whole train of new and baneful influences and impulses, formidably stimulating as a drug. These came among other evils materialism and covetousness and irreligion; overweening arrogance, and impatient contempt for the rights of the weak, a mania for world dominion, and a veritable lunacy of power worship."

3.

PRUSSIANIZED EDUCATION: ITS MEANING FOR OUR IDEALS OF MORALS AND GOVERNMENT.

With this brief account of the salient doctrines of the German philosophy of state and of morals so far as it bears directly on our theme we should now be in a position, I think, to appreciate at least in a measure the meaning of this philosophy for our people and its bearing on government conceived in liberty and dedicated to equality. The basis of such government is in Christian morality and the doctrine of the brotherhood of men. Deny these and equality vanishes and slavery becomes a fixed and lawful institution. Thus in proportion as this theory of morals and of state prevails among us our highest ideals of morality and government are undermined and destroyed.

It is this Prussianized education, these would-be lofty ideas of morals and of state, which the German autocracy is energetically spreading through the world. "It is Germany's duty," says one of her prominent writers, "to impose her superior ethical standards on the world." Particularly active has she been in this country. Through leagues and alliances, through text-books in our schools and universities, through a subsidized press, through Archibalds and Vierecks, through a thousand hidden channels, through many open channels, through young fools and through old fools, through wise fools and through ignorant fools, through designing fools and through stupid fools, through high-brows and through low-brows, through every possible method, device and agency she would force into the education of our children, of your child and of my child, her precepts of morals and of state, precepts whose legitimate effect would be to make our children worshippers of government of the autocracy, by the autocracy, for the autocracy and to transform them into the likeness of the wild beasts which have ravaged Belgium and some other of the fairest regions of Europe.

This is the Prussianization of our morals and our ideals of government.

With the object of this propaganda attained in any considerable measure how easy it would be to keep this country quiet while the rest of the world were brought, by force if necessary, under government Divine right. How bitter was the disappointment of the autocracy when it became apparent in this War that its carefully nurtured propaganda here had failed of its main purpose.

The insidious advances of this propaganda must be met with courage and eternal vigilance. Millions of our young men, the jeweled—the Gracchi gift of the motherhood of America to the cause of humanity and civilization—and no appeal for the cause of humanity and civilization is ever made in vain to the womanhood of America—millions of our young men are across the Atlantic or are destined to be there to battle against autocracy with all its hideous machinery of destruction and its heinous offences against the civilized code of honor. May it not happen—see to it that it does not happen—that what they win in Europe for liberty and government by the consent of the governed is lost in America by our base and supine surrender to propaganda. “Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet.”

V.

AUTOCRACY AND CIVILIZATION.

It would seem that the German autocrat is developing a new civilization distinct from the Christian. He calls it the higher civilization. It is characterized by its peculiar moral ideas and concepts. Interpreted in the light of the War, with the law of love limited to the family, clan or tribe, with right based on might, with the law of necessity replaced by the law of convenience, this civilization appeals to us as atavistic, a regression to type, resting on ethical concepts appropriate to the life of roving robber bands in the early history of the race detaching from their neighbors whatever they could take and hold; in comprehensiveness as a system as far above the intellectual reach of the cave man as beyond him in cruelty and calculated beastliness.

It was the moral phase in part, I think, which led the French with their quick and sure intuition to term this struggle from the beginning “The War for Civilization,” only incidentally for France. They were holding an advanced and vital position, sadly beleaguered and sorely punished, almost without hope, until the forces of civilization could be awakened and marshalled from the conflict. Their holding has been worthy of civilization and of France. The English were slow to realize the full meaning of the struggle but now they see and are holding as only aroused Englishmen can. The civilized world is responding to the call and hastening to the battlefield in order that the best of the world’s heritage from all the ages shall not be yielded up to sate the lust of a power-mad autocracy.

For this nation the die is cast. She will sacrifice wealth and blood that civilization shall not go down. But if this generation should prove to be recreant, and we shall not, but if we should, then would ring forth again the command “*Les morts, debout: The Dead, arise, Forward*” and we should see the long line of blue, the living and the dead, the Grand Army of the Republic, sweeping forward to save that nation which was conceived in liberty and dedicated to equality, to beat back the forces of autocracy and free the peoples they have

subjugated and enslaved and to make way once more for all that is highest and best in our civilization.

VI.

THE CIVIL WAR AND THE WORLD WAR.

The Civil War was the crowning event in the life of the nation preceding the present struggle. It freed four million slaves and proved that in the nation founded by the fathers the forces which make for union are stronger than those for disunion. It settled for all time, we hope, that this nation is one and indivisible. It has revealed the power and beneficence of self government by a free and enlightened people.

We may now see that the Civil War was an important step in the great process of emancipation of the race, a process which for the most part lies hidden in the womb of the future. At the close of the Civil War it could not have been foreseen that within half a century a world struggle would arise in the attempt of an ambitious autocracy to rule the world and make impossible of realization precisely those conceptions of government for which the Grand Army fought and bled. But it is so. The conflict is on. The Civil War is, therefore, no longer simply a great event in the life of a single nation, it is all that, but has become a great event in world history and in the advancement of civilization. This it has been potentially; this it now has become actually. The courage, the heroism and the devotion which won that struggle have ceased to be peculiarly our own and have become in the largest and best sense the common property of the world. Our heroes have become world heroes.

The struggle which ended at Appomattox is destined to play, I believe, an increasingly important part in human affairs. The principles of government there finally and firmly established for this nation will appeal more and more strongly to the people of the earth until at last government by the people for the people will be conterminous with civilization. The autocracy may be right after all in its belief of an irrepressible conflict and that the only alternative to ultimate downfall is world-power and world-dominion.

VII.

THE GRAND ARMY.

You see the members of the Grand Army marching along the street, with heads erect but shoulders stooped, with chest forward and a quick step; but you miss the fire in the eye and the exultation in the heart and the vision of deeds and comrades and leaders of other days. You may be tempted to give but a passing thought. But hold. They are the owners of the land. They bared their breasts to musket ball and cannon shot. They struggled in the fierce personal combat with saber and bayonet. They proffered the supremest sacrifice men

are ever called on to make to purchase privileges which you and I enjoy and prize most. Their title is unassailable. It is written in that record the ages are keeping in letters of gold, where Greece stands in the name of Leonidas and his Spartan band, and Rome in that of Horatius, him that kept the bridge in the brave days of old. They are the rightful proprietors here, but they are freely and graciously bestowing on us these rights and privileges. They are princes among men. Let us lift our hearts and voices in honor to them. Do it now. Down with the spirit that would crucify the living to make saints of the dead. The day is drawing to a close. Do not let them depart until we have shown appreciation of the courage, the generosity and the largeness of soul that mark heroes. Let us be devoutly thankful for the heritage of devotion they have given us. We are but sodden clay if it does not fire us into a nobler manhood and womanhood.

They are but a remnant. Across the river, almost in view, just beyond the trees, in the fields of Elysium is a mighty host of their comrades, the world's crowned immortals, those who made way for liberty, made way and died, each awarded the deed of honor in the measure of his devotion. There is the great silent commander whose hand was as gentle in peace as strong in war. There, too, towers the figure of another, intellectually and spiritually of larger mold than any other this continent has produced, in prophetic insight, in clearness and splendor of vision matchless since the days of Isaiah, whose hope was to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him that had borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan.

What treasures in our nation's life are here. May they be hal-
lowed in every heart. What examples of patriotism to fire the
imagination and mold the character of our youth to the end of time.
Inspired by them the present generation will take up the tasks of
the morrow soberly and seriously, will consecrate itself anew to the
duties and responsibilities of an enlightened and enlarged citizenship,
enlarged since we now stand consciously in a new relation to the
world, and with courage and resolution, whatever the sacrifices may
be, will press to a successful conclusion the present stupendous strug-
gle for self-government, for humanity and for civilization. When this
task is accomplished then we may answer back to the great leader of
the Civil War that the honored dead who died that this nation might
live have not died in vain and that the spirit of the Grand Army work-
ing through the present generation has wrought the mightiest eman-
cipation the world has known.

Four-Minute Talk

June 7, 1918

Our government warns that German agents are spreading the report through the country that our Allies are not doing their part in this struggle and are giving us, consequently, more than our share. The object is to create distrust and weaken our morale and lessen our efforts in this crisis.

Remember that the Teutons were ready when the War began and that the Allies were not, that large numbers of allied soldiers were permanently put out of action in stopping Germany's first fierce rushes to gain an immediate decision, that Russia dropped out practically as soon as England got ready, that the advantage in man power is now with the Teuton as seven to six and that he is operating on interior lines. The Teuton is exerting himself to the utmost to win before our Government can give effective help. This is why German agents wish us to delay the sending of fighting men to the front. They recommend that our men receive long training here, the longer the better; in fact, they prefer that our men stay permanently on this side.

It is absurd to think that the Allies are shirking. Shirking now spells for them absolute ruin. Britain has seven millions in the field and one-half million on the sea. She is keeping order in Egypt and India and Ireland in spite of German agents and is doing her share of the fighting on every front and her far flung battle line has many fronts. Her mighty battleships swing across the North Sea and as a result our shores are free from molestation by the German fleet. The British sailors are giving the German submarines the time of their lives, even if one or two of the latter did get across the Atlantic a few days ago.

Beware of those whispering propagandists who uphold our Government in public and damn our Allies in private. The chances are that at heart they are yellow. They are working in the interest, if not in the employ, of the German government. Beware of the man who has not yet decided on which side he stands and wants to "play little wife to both." It is no time for such nonsense. It is too costly. Our rights as a free and independent nation are at stake. Your brother and your son will have to lay down his life in atonement if you and I make the mistake of following the advice of German agents.

Hour-Minute Talk

July 12, 1918

The present War was begun for the aggrandizement of the Teutonic autocracy. That is still its object. Government by the consent of the governed, if it exists at all at the end of the War, is to occupy an inferior position. There is none to blink the issue. The fight is on. The autocracy means to win. If the sword fails, then diplomacy must secure the victory. It is a life and death struggle for free peoples.

Foreign Secretary Von Kuehlmann demanded as a basis of peace negotiations the recognition of the Central European Empire, or, as he blandly puts it, the boundaries of the four Central Powers "as prescribed by history." This in itself is an overwhelming victory for the Central Powers, so flexible are "the boundary prescribed by history." He further demanded the "Freedom of the Seas." In time of peace the sea is now as free as the air we breathe. This freedom was won and held for us by the British navy. It is one of Britain's great contributions to civilization. The phrase, the Freedom of the Seas, has no meaning for peace; it looks to a state of war. In war the belligerent that can not maintain the freedom of the seas has no right to it.

Boon, a member of the Prussian Upper House, interprets somewhat loosely, perhaps, the Junker idea of "The Freedom of the Seas" to mean that Britain surrender her fleet and give up such naval and coaling stations as Germany may designate; possibly, Halifax, the Bermudas and Vancouver. This gives Germany mastery over the seas. From Belgium we may learn what German mastery means. The Central European Empire gives mastery over the land so far as the eastern hemisphere is concerned; the Freedom of the Seas mastery over the waters of the entire earth. This means world domination. On this basis Germany is willing to consider peace.

Lest we should fail to understand all that is sinister in the German idea of the Freedom of the Seas, Dernberg, of blessed memory, rises to explain. He says: "Unhindered supplies, or all that is usually comprehended under the Freedom of the Seas must be guaranteed to the Central Powers. This guarantee of unhindered supplies interferes with the right of Congress under the Constitution to regulate commerce with foreign nations. It abridges our sovereignty, as likewise that of our allies. It levies tribute on the industry and resources of the world. America will not bow the neck to that yoke; she will not pay tribute to Germany.

Assuming that the present conflict may result in a draw the Teutons have prepared another threat against the world. Their peace terms with Russia give them control of the great natural highways by which early peoples reached Europe from their orig-

inal home in Central Asia. By means of railways along these routes, and Russia has built important sections of these roads, they plan to open the way for commerce with the east, China, India and Japan. It is an all land route or by inland waters with no land competition and inaccessible from the sea. Having secured commerce with the east the Teutons will be in a position to reopen the question of world domination with greatly improved chances. No blockade could then hurt them seriously. Their submarines, if no device or agency should be discovered for combatting them effectively, could make ocean-going trade by either canal, Suez or Panama, or by either cape, Good Hope or Horn, so costly and dangerous as practically to stop commercial relations between Asia on the one hand and America and western Europe on the other. By means of this virtual blockade the Teutons think it should be possible to force the yielding of America and Britain and thus to win the goal of their ambition, the domination of the world. The Saulsbury resolution recently introduced into the Senate providing for the tripartite control of the Pacific by England, Japan and the United States recognizes that the Teutons may not be so considerate as to postpone this attack on commerce with the east until the next war.

The only effective bar against this threat is to defeat Germany now, beat her to her knees, destroy her land power, take from her the means of again disturbing the peace of the world of her own will and choice, punish her so thoroughly that she will be able to distinguish a hospital ship from merchantman and avoid it from as great a distance as she is now able to hit a church or cathedral with her long range guns, so thoroughly that her abominations in Belgium and elsewhere will look as ugly to her as they do now to the rest of the world.

We have added this year one million tons to our shipping and are adding more. We have one million armed men in France and can put another million there in a short time. We have a population of rather more than one hundred and ten million—more than the total of Great Britain and Ireland, France and Italy. We can raise and support as large an army as can all these nations combined. The American people are ready and waiting to send an army of five millions across the sea and to support the fighting line with a reserve of three millions more at home just as soon as our Government calls. America is ready to build ships and to furnish all money and supplies necessary to keep the Teutons from getting a death grip on the throat of the world, so that they can make our children and our children's children their industrial and political slaves. America must be made safe for our children and for the development of our institutions. The world must be made safe for free government. America can make it so, and she will.

Our Country

(A Fragment.)

July, 1918.

Ours is a large country. It is unified and held together by the ease of intercommunication between its several parts. The great rivers of the Mississippi valley, affording the means of communication from north to south and from south to north, are chains binding the inhabitants of the valley into one great people. They are the Almighty's pledge that this valley shall not be separated into two nations by an east and west line. This pledge blocked the efforts of the Confederacy to set up a new nation. The railroads would relieve the Almighty of this responsibility by opposing an increase of river navigation and by paralleling the rivers with lines of railway. While we prefer that railways supplement rather than displace river navigation, still these railways stimulate trade and travel along the great natural highways and consequently tend hold the valley as one people. But were every railroad to go into bankruptcy tomorrow the Almighty's pledge would still prevail and preserve us from any division into two nations by a line athwart the valley.

The Atlantic, the Gulf and the Pacific operate to hold the dwellers in our coastal territory in one political organization. The Great Lakes and the trans-continental lines of railway bind the Atlantic with the Pacific. These agencies are supplemented by the telegraph and the telephone. Thus the work of man to improve communication is co-operating with the forces of nature, all tending in the same direction to hold us as parts of one and the same social and political entity.

As a somewhat more subtle influence the great newspapers are an important agency in molding thought and unifying purpose so that we may be in truth one people. In our city libraries we find papers from Boston, New York, Washington, New Orleans, Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Minneapolis, Chicago, St. Louis. From these papers we may gather the thoughts and sentiments of the people of the different parts of the country and thus place ourselves in a position to prevent, or at least to check, that ingrowing tendency to provincialism and consequent sectionalism, to hinder the development of the magnified ego, which would sacrifice the interests of the nation as a whole for some petty concern of our own.

Our postal system, providing the means for easy and rapid communication, is another strong agency for unification. So far, however, as the zone system hinders the distribution of our great papers and tends to change their character from a national to purely local one, so far does it work against the unification of the nation. This is far above any mere money consideration and is entitled to the earnest consideration of every patriot.

Seventeen million of our people are foreign born. This is almost one-sixth of our entire population. These foreign-born bring their

own customs, habits of thought and their own language. They do not speak our tongue or think our thoughts or possess our ideals of life and morals or share our views relating to government. In many cases they have their own language newspapers. These seem to make it unnecessary to learn to use our tongue. Many of these foreign-born, in consequence remain incommunicado so far as we are concerned. They are not in the melting pot. The process of amalgamation does not touch them. They contribute nothing to our social and political life; we have no influence on theirs. They are always looking toward the east when we are facing the west and looking toward the west when we are facing the east. They are the legitimate prey of the anarchist and the dynamiter. The demagogue can play his game to the limit through their language newspapers without serious danger of detection and exposure. So long as they refuse to learn and use our speech they constitute a grave menace to our liberties and our institutions.

The Bethlehem Steel Company employes about 20,000 men. Of these 10,000, one-half the total number, are foreign-born. These foreign-born speak fifty-eight different languages. Of these 10,000 more than one-half replied on inquiry that they did not wish to become citizens of this country. The older men said that their money would be taken from them if they became citizens. This word had been whispered about among them. So long as they do not speak our tongue there is no effective way to meet these slanders. These prospective citizens had been poisoned by unscrupulous plotters and foreign agents to their own hurt and to the hurt of the country whose hospitality they shared.

The building of the tower of Babel had to be discontinued because of the confusion of tongues. No other great structure can be erected where the workers cannot understand one another. No great or permanent state can be constructed on the polyglott plan. There might be, just as well, fifty-eight Chinese walls in this country as fifty-eight different spoken tongues. In fact the inert Chinese walls would constitute a far less dangerous obstacle to free intercommunication and be fraught with less serious consequences to our social and political life.

The confusion of tongues is the Almighty's mark for destruction. Either Austria-Hungary's many tongues will be merged into one or Austria-Hungary will cease to form one independent state. The Almighty knows that the confusion of tongues will stop the building of a state as certainly as it did that of the tower of Babel.

In South Dakota at least twenty-five languages are brought into the State yearly according to recent reports on Vital Statistics. The question of language is a serious one for this commonwealth. It is not unknown even now that communities have been formed in this State which hold their own laws and customs to be superior in binding force to the laws of the State and nation. However admirable in many respects these people may be, and we have no desire to bring against them a railing accusation, their course spells but one thing for the

States and that is ruin in the measure their program prevails among our citizens.

It is sometimes apparently held that the remedy for all these evils lies in having the foreign-born assume citizenship at once on his arrival to our shores. But it ought not to be necessary to argue that a wolf in the sheepfold is more dangerous to the sheep than a wolf outside the sheepfold. An alien who does not know our tongue and will not learn it is all the more dangerous with the power of the ballot in his possession. By all means withhold citizenship and the privilege of voting until the immigrant has learned to speak fluently our language, so that he may understand us and we may understand him. In the case of immigrants from countries having dual citizenship laws deny the rights of citizenship to all foreign-born. To their children born and brought up in this country the privilege of citizenship possibly might be open. In this way, perhaps, some of the obvious evils of dual citizenship might be lessened.

With unlimited confidence in the justness and efficiency of our principles of government we have been an easy-going people politically. But a great nation, no more than a great building, can be constructed without thought and almost infinite care and trouble. Nations have their periods of youth and growth, of maturity and power, of old age and decay. We can not allow communities with strang tongues to grow up in our midst without hastening the period of age and decay. As every nation in history guilty of negligence regarding God's mandate on the confusion of tongues has suffered, so must we reap the consequences of stupidity or indifference or of political cowardice. The nation the fathers founded can not endure half American and half polyglott. We have no real need of the foreign language newspaper. It is a menace. Let us insist that the foreigner who comes to dwell with us shall show us the decent respect of learning our language, so that he may communicate to us what he brings of value in social or moral or political thought, so that we may make clear to him our aims and purposes. Ease of intercommunication is necessary to our unity and to our permanence as a nation. Let us steadily and continually press for the realization of the truth that this is one people with one tongue and one flag.



Some War Problems

The Freedom of the Seas.

July and August, 1918.

We are at war with a great nation. We were forced into the struggle in spite of earnest efforts to keep out. We complied with the requirements of international law and exercised a forbearance quite unusual in the case of first class powers. Nevertheless our antagonist

was not satisfied until we had taken up the gage of battle which he had thrown down. What is the character of our opponent? What are his aims? Why was he so eager to compel our entrance into the conflict?

CHARACTER.

Germany is governed by an autocracy. This autocracy rules by Divine right. In its philosophy of state and morals power or might makes right. Since the state is the expression of greatest power or might in society, whatever the state does or directs is right. Therefore, whatever the autocracy directs is right and should be obeyed.

Since might makes right treaties are to be observed only so long as they may be advantageous to the stronger contracting power. They are "scraps of paper." There is no international law in time of war because there is no power able to enforce it against Germany. It is right to corrupt the citizens of a neighboring state, to foment industrial troubles and to incite to crime and insurrection so long and so far as this interference is not effectively resented. In all these cases the power to do things with impunity confers the right to do them.

In this philosophy the state is the highest ideal of organized society as well as the embodiment of its power. Consequently it is the highest duty of the citizen to serve the state. The greater the service to the state by its citizens the higher in the scale of development is their civilization. The Germans surpass all other peoples in their service of the state. Therefore, they stand above and apart from all other peoples in culture and civilization. They are the chosen people. They are to dominate the nations of the earth. In the great ruling organization or empire through which this domination is to be exercised only those of German blood and speech are to have the rights of citizens. The subject races or nationalities will be forced to find their highest mission in ministering to the needs and wishes of their German rulers. Their own aims and hopes are to be given up and their activities directed to the exaltation of the German people. And as a necessary consequence of this situation the arrogance of the Germans toward subject peoples will be increased.

This philosophy is based on the theory of the survival of the fittest in the struggle for existence, a struggle in which pity and mercy have no place. It is a ruthless application of the doctrine of the bloody tooth and claw. It is a biological law transferred without modification to the realm of international relations. Whether power is won in open and honorable struggle or by deceit and treachery is a matter of indifference. In either case it increases the chances of the survival in the struggle for existence. Further power or success throws over actions of whatever character the mantle and sanctity of right. Power is the principal thing. Therefore get power. It is not merely a fortunate thing for the state to increase its power, it is a positive duty to do so. And in thus increasing its power the rights and privileges of other nations are to be disregarded and overridden. Toward other nations

and other peoples the German is as ruthless as toward the unprotected traveller on the sea.

AIMS.

The aim of the German is, as his theory requires, world power and world domination. He has phrased it to himself as world power or downfall. This world power is all embracing. A German writer says: "If we are asked whether we wish to establish a world power towering so far above all other world powers that it is in reality the only world power, then the answer is that the will to world power is immeasurable. Less even than a great power can a world power ever be satisfied."

The conception of world power has received much attention from German writers and publicists. It has proven to be particularly attractive to the Pan-German. He publishes with the utmost frankness regarding that portion of his neighbor's territory which should be incorporated at the earliest possible moment into the German empire. In his explanation of the justness and desirability of such action he is embarrassed by no delicacy of feeling and is indifferent to the deep resentment his statements are awakening in his neighbor. The amenities and conventionalities of intercourse between friendly peoples are as banalities to him. Hence he usually illustrates his theme with maps so as not to be misunderstood or not to mollify in any way the bluntness of his treatment of the subject. The successive steps by which world power is to be realized have been worked out, many of them, in great detail by the German General Staff. World domination was based on a central European empire. In the winning of this empire the World War was a necessary step. Just how much more was to be realized from the war it is not now possible to state definitely. If the outcome of the war should be favorable much might be realized. But should the result be against him, the Teuton would deny that conquest had ever been a part of his aims. He was fighting simply in defense of the Fatherland. The course of the war generally has been favorable to the Germans, inclining sometimes to the one side and sometimes to the other. When the tide has been with the Teuton his greed and cruelty and arrogance have known no limit; when it has been against him he has been an ardent lover of peace on the basis of the status quo ante.

REASONS FOR FORCING THE UNITED STATES INTO THE WAR

The German autocracy rules by Divine right. In this country however, the powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed. The two conceptions of government are in violent antagonism. The two sources of power are as far apart as the poles. Government by the consent of the governed has appealed widely and strongly to the peoples of the earth. Where an unhindered choice has been possible they have preferred government by the consent of the governed to that by Divine right. This possibility and danger was

clearly foreseen by the Holy Alliance. It attempted to stifle popular government. The German autocracy is the heir of the Holy Alliance. It is the enemy of government by the people. The ultimate aims of the autocracy must include, therefore, the overthrow or humiliation of the most formidable representative of popular government. This is also necessary to world power. The survival of the fittest in the struggle for existence requires that government by the people shall perish from the earth in order that government by Divine right may flourish in all its proper richness and luxuriance. The overthrow may be accomplished by force of arms or by the undermining process of the German propaganda. Propaganda is the cheaper method. But it was apparent by the end of the year 1916 that German propaganda in this country, although strong, was not strong enough to control the policy of the government. This had to be gained, if at all, by war.

At times the German has had visions of complete victory. He was rather more than obsessed with these in 1914. He foresaw the Russian collapse in 1917 while yet others only suspected it. He had direct information of the progress of his plottings there. With Russia out of the way the decisive defeat and humiliation of France and Britain in a short time seemed to him assured. In the peace terms dictated to his enemies he could recoup himself for all his losses. Further he could levy on the fleets of France and Britain until sea domination should pass definitely and unquestionably to him. He could also greatly increase his man power by absorbing French and British possessions.

Under such circumstances the good will of the United States did not seem to be worth any considerable sacrifice. If she entered the war at all, and this was doubtful, she could not make her influence felt, so he reasoned, until long after France and England had been crushed. And then standing alone she would be no match for the forces Germany could bring against her. Thus at one stroke in his visions his principal rivals and antagonists were vanquished and his dream of world power was realized. So at the end of the year 1916 it seemed to the German an auspicious time to force a situation which meant war with the United States or, if not war, a diplomatic humiliation of this government which would be even more disastrous to our world influence than defeat in war. Whether the German was correct in his forecast, the outcome of the war alone can tell. At present there is much to suggest that the Teuton made a slight miscalculation and that, in consequence, the realization of his hopes will have to be postponed indefinitely.

There is some evidence to show that before 1914 our diplomats were wont to maintain a deferential and complaisant attitude toward German diplomacy. There are some indications, I fear, that the leading strings binding us to Germany were not cut until long after the outbreak of the World War, possibly not completely cut until a considerable time had elapsed after our entrance in to the war. It may be permissible, then, to call attention to the patent fact that no real sympathy, no partnership based on mutual interest, in the nature of the case, can exist between the German government and our own.

This arises in part from the enduring enmity of the autocracy toward free government. It comes in part from the determination of the autocracy to dominate the world and to subject all nations, our own included, to the imperious will that rules Germany.

The World War has brought forward some great problems for decision. Americans are obliged perforce to forget their traditional isolation and consider these problems in the light of history and in their bearing on the interests of the family of nations as a whole. Some of these problems are so bound up with the aims and purposes of the autocracy that we can comprehend their full significance only in the measure that we grasp the trend and character of German ambitions.

I.

THE FREEDOM OF THE SEAS.

One of these problems is The Freedom of the Seas. Let us study it in relation to the preceding discussion. We will first state the problem as it had formulated itself in the period preceding the war. Briefly and only in outline its main features follow:

The phrase, the Freedom of the Seas, is a technical one. In time of peace the seas are now as free as the air we breathe. They were not always so. Not many centuries ago certain nations claimed and enforced the right to exclude from designated parts of the open seas all vessels not carrying their flag. The celebrated treatise of Grotius on The Freedom of the Seas was an argument for the rights of all vessels of whatever nationality, and of the Dutch in particular, to sail the open seas in time of peace without let or hindrance. It had nothing to do with a state of war. But the case for the freedom of the seas in time of peace was won after a long struggle on the seas by Britain. Then it was necessary to police these waters for many of them were infested with pirates. These had to be exterminated and piracy completely suppressed. This again was largely the work of Britain. Thus the Freedom of the Seas in times of peace is one of Britain's great contributions to civilization.

The Freedom of the Seas in contemporary discussion can not refer, therefore, to a time of peace. In fact it contemplates a state of war, is a war phrase. The weaker belligerent on the sea and the neutral who wishes to avail himself of blockade prices for his goods are always clamorous for the Freedom of the Seas, and naturally so. In addition there are certain publicists who have advocated the doctrine in the belief, a mistaken one, we think, that its acceptance as a part of the law of nations would tend to discourage war and promote peace.

In the discussions of the Freedom of the Seas in the period immediately preceding the war three principal views were brought forward, which I shall designate as 1. The Traditional View; 2. The American View; 3. The German View.

THE TRADITIONAL VIEW.

The Traditional View is based primarily on the distinction between enemy commerce on the sea and neutral. The underlying principle is that enemy goods on the sea are liable to seizure whether in enemy or neutral ships; that neutral goods not contraband are not so liable. This principle has been somewhat modified in practice. The most important change was made in the Declaration of Paris which laid down the rule that the neutral flag covers enemy goods not contraband. Neutral goods may become so identified with enemy in two principal ways as to be liable to seizure. They may be contraband or they may be involved in the vessel's attempt to run a blockade. In some cases a neutral ship carrying contraband is liable to confiscation. This is always true when the vessel is taken in an attempt to evade a blockade.

In all cases involving the seizure of neutral property, whether goods or ship, it must be brought by the captor into one of his own ports and then turned over to a regularly organized court, the so-called prize court, in order that the legality of the seizure may be determined. This procedure gives the neutral an opportunity to defend his goods or vessel and to show, if he can, that he is entitled to its return with damages. But it is only after a hearing in court that neutral property may be adjudged a lawful prize and condemned.

These statements are sufficient, perhaps, to characterize this view of the Freedom of the Seas. Of course it is the merest outline. For details and exceptions and disputed cases a standard treatise on international law may be consulted.

THE AMERICAN VIEW.

The American view is grounded on the distinction between public property and private at sea. Normally no property at sea is liable to capture or confiscation except enemy public property. Contraband may be seized, but usually this is enemy public property. In this view as in the preceding a judicial review of the case in a port of the belligerent making the capture precedes the confiscation of neutral property. In this way the interests of the neutral and the belligerent are guarded. This view is very favorable to neutral trade. It would insist that warring nations interfere as little as possible with seagoing commerce. It is further in accord with the conception of war as a struggle between the armed forces of the contending nations and not between their citizens as such.

It ignores the fact that with this view prevailing all enemy public property would appear on the sea ostensibly as private property. From this fact would arise endless disputes in court and ultimately in diplomatic circles as to the real character and ownership of the property in question. And in these disputes lurks always the possibility and the danger of war.

Further, the normal procedure of the belligerent desiring to evade the rules holding under this view is greatly to extend the list of contra-

band. And in this is another source of friction between neutrals and belligerents. In consequence it can not be affirmed with confidence that in practice the American view would work more smoothly and satisfactorily in adjusting the conflicting claims of neutral and belligerent than the Traditional View does.

Admiral Mahan, the author of the *Influence of Sea Power on History*, opposes the American position in these words: "Ships and cargoes in transit upon the sea are private property in only one point of view and that the narrowest. Internationally considered they are national wealth in the course of reproducing and multiplying itself, to the intensification of the national power, and that by the most effective process; for it relieves the nation from feeding itself, and makes the whole outer world contribute to its support. It is, therefore, a most proper object of attack; more humane, and more conducive to the objects of war, than the slaughter of men. A great check to war would be removed by assuring immunity to a nation's sea-borne trade, the life-blood of its power, the assurer of its credit, the purveyor of its comfort."

THE GERMAN VIEW.

The German View is characterized broadly by its failure to make any distinction between neutral and enemy commerce. Germany claims the right, for instance, to locate mines in home or enemy waters or upon the open sea, thus making navigation dangerous alike to friend and foe, neutral and belligerent. For carrying contraband neutral vessels may be punished by seizure and destruction. At the second Hague Conference Germany expressed a willingness to agree to the rule that enemy merchant vessels should not be molested except when carrying contraband or attempting to run a blockade. These rules must be combined with another, viz., that Germany permits her merchant vessels to change their character on the high seas. They may there throw aside their peaceful character and become vessels of war. This is contrary to the Traditional View and to American practice, which requires this change to be made in a home port of the vessel. Thus the German rule permits a merchantman to leave a port with a legitimate cargo. She may then on the open sea or at some neutral port take on guns and munitions. When outside neutral jurisdiction she may assume the character of a war vessel and prey on enemy and neutral commerce, destroying merchant vessels on the ground that they were carrying contraband. In the German theory there is no requirement that the vessel shall be brought into port in order to settle the question of the legitimacy of the capture before a prize court. This question may be settled once for all by a "Quarter-deck decision" given by the officer making the capture. The neutral has no recourse except to appeal usually through diplomatic channels. If finally the case be referred to a prize court the neutral may find his case compromised by the loss or destruction of the ship's papers.

The reason for German insistence on contraband is clear. She had

war material in abundance, was, in fact, one great arsenal. Other nations were not so supplied with war munitions. In the event of war they would need to supplement their stores by importation. These munitions would be contraband and the vessels carrying them liable to capture and confiscation or destruction. Germany would need no such imports. She could well afford to make all vessels, enemy as well as neutral immune from capture so long as they carried food and clothing and other non-contraband articles which Germany would certainly need in time of war, provided she were permitted to capture or destroy all vessels carrying contraband. For without this importation of war supplies her most probable enemy could not carry on war at all. Under the conditions prevailing before the World War with the rule desired by Germany in force a contest between Germany and the United States would have been decided against the latter before she could have provided even a small army with adequate arms and equipment. The legitimate effect of such a rule would be that nations increase their armament and keep their military establishments in readiness for instant war.

THE PEACE CONFERENCE.

The subject of contraband engaged the attention of the Second Hague Conference held in 1907. The British delegates proposed to abolish contraband altogether. This proposal, however, did not gain the endorsement of the Conference, being opposed by the United States and Germany. In view of the groups of nations at war the alignment on this question is interesting. Opposing the proposal were the United States, Germany, Austria-Hungary and Turkey; in favor, Great Britain, France, Russia, Italy and Japan, to give only the principal nations represented. Had this proposal been accepted by the Conference then the only interference at sea with neutral property would have arisen in connection with blockade.

The delegates from the United States proposed that conditional contraband be abolished. But this proposal did not commend itself to the Conference. The German delegates not only desired to retain contraband but also sought to soften the doctrine of "continuous voyage." This latter doctrine is frequently, but not necessarily, connected with contraband. The reason for the German attitude on this question is apparent. In the event of the blockade of her coast, as in the present war, she could the more readily secure supplies through her neutral neighbors.

While the attitude of the German delegates toward the doctrine of continuous voyage and the abolishing of contraband is perfectly clear and intelligible that of the delegates from the United States in opposing this latter proposition and in advocating the abolishing of conditional contraband is something of a puzzle, unless we make the unwelcome assumption that these delegates were being used as a cat's paw for Germany and her allies. Their attitude in both cases favored Germany, while with the abolition of contraband nearly everything the

Americans professed to want except the prohibition of the commercial blockade would have been gained.

"In My Four Years in Germany" Ambassador Gerrard says: "Von Bethmann-Hollweg always desired to make any settlement of the submarine question contingent upon our doing something against Great Britain," p. 337. And again, pp. 340, 341: "He [the German emperor] asked me why we had done nothing to Great Britain because of her alleged violations of international law—why we had not broken the British blockade." And, p. 342, "I said that it was not our business to break the blockade—that there were plenty of German agents in the United States who could send food ships and test the question."

How delicately the suggestion is put in the last sentence. From all these things one untutored in the ways of diplomacy might be tempted to suspect that for a long time it has been the custom of German and American diplomats, whenever two or three of them are gathered together, to discuss ways and means of embarrassing Great Britain. The dickering seems to have a background. For the Kaiser is apparently pained at the unwonted and reluctant attitude of the United States.

MINES.

At this same Conference Britain proposed to prohibit the use of unanchored, automatic mines at sea which do not become harmless as soon as they break from their anchorage; to prohibit the laying of mines in the open sea; to permit it only in the waters of the belligerents and there only before naval ports and not before commercial ones, where they might interfere with neutral commerce.

These proposals make for the freedom and safety of the sea for neutral commerce; but they were rejected by the Conference. Germany opposed any restrictions whatever on the right to lay mines at sea, or to use mines to obstruct commerce. In a war between England and Germany it was readily seen that German commerce would be driven from the ocean except so far as it might be carried in neutral bottoms. Consequently mines placed anywhere at sea would not interfere with German shipping. They might, however, prove to be very annoying to Great Britain. And it is not in accord with German policy to be concerned with the interests of neutrals. Germany did propose that all mines be prohibited for a period of five years. This was interpreted at the time to mean that she did not anticipate war in that period. The American delegates seem to have taken little interest in the question of mines at sea. I have been unable to find any explicit reference to their attitude on this question.

The attitudes of the three countries, Great Britain, Germany and America, at the two Conferences of Hague and London are summarized by a British writer on international law somewhat on this fashion:

The British aim was to reduce to a minimum the restrictions upon neutral trade consistent with the maintenance of the chief offensive

weapon of a naval power—the weapon of attack against the trade of its enemy.

The German view was, as far as possible, to disarm the stronger naval power while leaving to the weaker naval power every weapon of offence or defence. In pressing this purpose no regard whatever was had to the rights of neutrals.

The American view was to abolish all restrictions upon sea going trade, neutral and belligerent alike, in time of war, save only the carriage of contraband: thus depriving sea power of its chief weapon of offence.

The German aim and the American are alike in striving to deprive sea-power of its chief offensive weapon, an attack on enemy commerce. They differ in that while Germany aggressively seeks advantage for the weaker sea-power America is content with advantages to neutral commerce.

THE FREEDOM OF THE SEAS SINCE 1914.

Let us first consider the American view as it is at present purely academical, having had no appreciable influence on the course of events in the war. The American view of the Freedom of the Seas was drawn up by Secretary Lansing for the meeting of the American Institute of International Law held at Havana, January 22, 1917. According to the Independent the American view is as follows:

"The commercial blockade, both of belligerent ports and the maritime zones along belligerent coasts, is formally forbidden, no matter what the means by which the blockade is to be effected. Private property on the open sea is inviolable. Belligerent and neutral merchant vessels may in no case be confiscated or sunk, under any pretext whatever. If carrying contraband, this may be confiscated or destroyed by the captor. The right of search is abolished. The official or private postal correspondence of neutrals or belligerents found in the open sea on board a neutral or enemy vessels is inviolable."

This is the latest formulation of the American view. It forbids the capture of private property at sea, the confiscation or sinking of merchantmen, the interference with mails, the commercial blockade, and the right of search.

The only way in which a belligerent may lawfully interfere with commerce is in the case of contraband taken either on the open sea or in an attempt to evade blockade. In denying the right of search, however, this theory prohibits the belligerent from determining whether any given vessel is carrying contraband. For no honest skipper would ever be found at sea, whatever his cargo, with irregular or compromising papers.

Thus the American view in its most recent formulation practically forbids any interference with commerce on the sea, enemy or neutral, legitimate or contraband. It completely pulls the teeth of sea-power against either neutral or enemy commerce.

If this attitude toward contraband dates back to the Conferences

of the Hague and London, then there is no obvious reason why the American delegates at the second Hague Conference should have opposed the proposal to abolish contraband, save possibly as a favor to some other nation. And this is not a wholly creditable excuse. Germany's ideas of war on the sea center around contraband. She has used it as a reason or a pretext for the destruction of merchantmen at sea.

THE ENTENTE ALLIES.

The Entente Allies have maintained a complete blockade of the Central Powers on all commerce entering or leaving by an enemy or a neutral port. It removes at one stroke the restrictions against extending a blockade to neutral coasts or ports. It may be regarded, perhaps, as an extension of the doctrine of "continuous voyage." It was announced, however, simply as a retaliatory measure. As such it has good and rightful standing in international law. At first the United States protested; but later acquiesced and is now assisting with enthusiasm in this blockade. The Entente Allies deny to neutral mails the privilege of carrying contraband or otherwise engaging in unneutral service. This has involved a censorship of the mails. But all this might be held as the logical result of the blockade of the Central Powers as a retaliation. The opportunity for using the mails for unneutral service is so great that the mails for an enemy port should be subjected to as close an examination as any other part of the vessel's cargo.

THE CENTRAL POWERS.

On the other hand the Central Powers have planted or sown mines indiscriminately, have destroyed neutral vessels carrying constructive contraband without judicial decision, have denied the obligation to safeguard the lives of non-combatants whose ships have been sunk, have slain or drowned enemy non-combatants without hesitation, have destroyed neutral property, including postal correspondence, without compensation, have claimed and exercised the right to destroy enemy and neutral shipping, their cargoes and their passengers at sight in certain areas of the sea which they have arbitrarily marked out, have asserted that a blockade to be legal need not be real or effective.

Sufficient has been said to show that German Freedom of the Seas is altogether different from the traditional freedom or that of the American view. In fact it is no freedom of the sea at all except to the German freebooter. It is hard to understand how it was possible for the American delegations to the two peace conferences to be led by the nose in the interests of such a sea policy as Germany practices. It differs from the American policy in substituting "Quarterdeck decisions" for those of the Prize Court, in the wanton destruction of neutral property, and in the wholesale murder of neutrals and non-combatants instead of a proper care of them.

GERMAN AND AMERICAN FREEDOM.

Germany can not support the American Freedom of the Seas except as a temporary device for advancing her own measures. This arises necessarily from the German conception of war. The German War Book declares that war is not to be conceived wholly as a contest between the armed forces of the belligerents. The object of war, it says, is to destroy the spiritual and material power of the enemy country. Now one of the most effective ways of doing this, in German opinion, is by waging war on private citizens. This is what she has done and is doing now in Belgium and northern France. This is what she has done and is doing on the sea. Nothing could be more aversive to the German than the distinction between public and private property. It would be subversive of what is distinctive in the German conception of war.

Hence, while we may find that Germany in conferences will support the American view in order to overthrow the traditional view, yet when it comes to actual warfare she will do as she has done, pay no attention whatever to American Freedom of the Seas, but will follow out her own notions on the subject. Besides, her law of necessity which overrides the rules of war would not permit her to comply honestly with any rules of sea law laid down in advance.

FREEDOM OF THE SEAS IN THE PEACE PROPOSALS.

In the terms proposed as a necessary basis for a peace conference Foreign Secretary Von Kuehlmann included the Freedom of the Seas. The German view as modified by the war then becomes a matter of immediate interest. A member of the Prussian Upper House, Von Roon by name, in criticising these proposals as too mild, claims that the British must surrender their fleet and give up such coaling and naval stations as Germany may designate. While it, perhaps, may not be legitimate in the strict sense to regard this as the modified German view of the Freedom of the Seas, it nevertheless clearly foreshadows the purpose of the Teutons to dominate the seas on the conclusion of peace. This domination would undoubtedly be felt in time of peace as well as in war.

However, Dernberg of odorous memory proceeds to interpret in the strict sense the prevailing German view of the Freedom of the Seas. He says: "Unhindered supplies or all that is usually comprehended under the Freedom of the Seas must be guaranteed to the Central Powers." How are these supplies to be guaranteed? Is Germany to hold Belgium for a period of years as a hostage? Must ships or naval stations be surrendered as the guarantee? It is the right of Congress under the Constitution to regulate foreign commerce. Must we abridge our sovereignty in this matter and accept the dictation of a foreign power? However, the guarantee may be arranged it is clear that in the name of the Freedom of the Seas the Central Powers would levy tribute on the industry and resources of the Allied world.

But this is not its complete significance. It is not only a policy of aggression but as well of repression. This is clear from the plan pursued in Belgium and northern France and other territories occupied by the Teuton armies. The machinery from manufacturing plants, so far as the Teutons deemed it valuable, was shipped to Germany, the rest destroyed. At the close of the War this captured machinery may be set up at once and made profitable, provided "unhindered supplies" of all kinds can be had. The Germans could thus enter the markets of the world unhampered by competition in certain lines for a considerable period.

The devastated regions would require some years for the rebuilding of their plants. This period might be considerable prolonged by a suitable selection of the guaranteed supplies. These countries ravaged by the War would be handicapped first by the capture or destruction of their machinery and second by the unfavorable conditions under which it must be replaced. Thus under the fair sounding phrase of the Freedom of the Seas lurks an unfair scheme for dominating the trade of the world. Of course, in view of these things America and the Entente Allies are justified in taking adequate measures for their economic protection during the period of reconstruction following the War.

And now comes Chancellor Von Helfferich with the statement that peace by negotiation clearly can not be impossible since America and Germany agree as to the Freedom of the Seas. Here is an explicit declaration involving us in the approval of precisely that offense which we affirmed drove us into the War. And further a tacit approval of all the horrors on the sea Germany has committed and of her plans for commercial aggression. Yet no government official and no great editor has had the hardihood to stand up and deny the soft impeachment and say plainly we will have none of Germany's Freedom of the Seas.

II.

THE FAR EAST.

The question we have been discussing assumes enhanced importance in view of the Brest-Litovsk treaty dictated to Russia by the Central Powers. By this treaty, according to reports at the time it was made, three hundred thousand square miles of territory and twenty millions of people passed from Russian to Teuton control. This means when the territory is properly organized a vast increase in the wealth and man power of the Central Powers. Important concessions were made by Russia to Turkey by which the administration of certain areas near the Black and Caspian Seas were turned over to the Ottoman empire. These areas lie in the old land routes by which in early times primitive peoples reached Europe from their original home in central Asia. It is possible to open again a way for travel and commerce along these routes and in this way to connect Berlin with the far east, China, India and Japan. We may fol-

low, for example, the railroad from Berlin to Constantinople, thence by water on the Black Sea to Batum, from Batum by rail to Baku on the southwestern shore of the Caspian Sea. Thence by water across the Caspian to Krasnovodsk; from Krasnovodsk by rail to Tashkent and beyond on the western border of Chinese Turkestan. From Tashkent the road might be extended east into China or southeast into India as the needs of commerce or war should require.

By the peace treaty between Russia and the Central Powers, Baku and the adjacent territory passed into Turkey's sphere of influence. Baku, the Caspian terminal of the railway connecting the Black and Caspian seas is the center of one of the richest oil-producing regions in the world, yielding about one-fifth of the total annual supply of oil. This region is one of the great commercial prizes of the nearer east.

That the Entente Allies, particularly England, would view this arrangement with satisfaction was not to be expected. The importance attached by official England to the possibilities just pointed out is shown by the recent report (August 20, 1918), that English forces had reached Baku by crossing Persia from the neighborhood of the valley of the Tigris in order to dispute the possession of this region with Turkey. The acquisition of this route by the Central Powers would expose India to an attack from the northwest. Britain will resist the attempt of the Central Powers to control this route to the limit of her powers. A still more recent report states that British troops have reached Bokhara, near the ancient Samarkand, on the road from Krasnovosk to Tashkent. This further emphasizes Britain's determination to checkmate any attempt on the part of the Central Powers to get within easy striking distance from India.

Another route to the east had long been in the German mind. This is the Berlin-Bagdad route, which originally was planned to reach a port at the head of the Persian gulf. But shortly after this purpose became known Britain assumed control of the shore along the head of this gulf, and the extension of the road to a seaport ceased to be practical. But from Bagdad it may be quite possible to build a road through Persia following the old Caravan routes to China and India. But this plan has now been rendered unfeasible by British possession of Bagdad and the surrounding region.

There is another possible route. This leads along the northern shore of the Caspian into the valley of the Volga. Thence Berlin may be reached directly by land routes or again by the Black Sea to Constantinople and thence on by rail. But the temper of the Russian people at present seems to shut out the possibility of utilizing this route. Further the great Czecho-Slovak movement has now reached the valley of the Volga and the way for its support by Japan and the Allies has been opened in eastern Siberia. It is entirely possible that this movement will enlist the sympathy and support of the people of southern Russia. If so, to Germany the value

of this route is practically nil. In fact, without this, the route is blocked by British possession of Bokhara.

*But grant that the Germans secure the control of one or more of these routes to the east. The commercial advantages are very considerable. Such a route opens up the mineral resources, the agricultural and manufactured products of China, India and Japan, as well as the resources of the Asiatic countries through which the route may pass. The coal deposits in China are reported to be the largest and finest in the world; there are large deposits of iron; copper is to be found. India has also valuable products. Through China trade can be opened with Japan and the Islands of the Pacific. It will always be true that much of this trade can be brought to western Europe more economically by water than by rail. A considerable part of this trade, however, might be diverted to a land route. When once this trade were organized and developed it would add much to

THE ROUTE TO THE EAST AND WORLD POWER.

Grant that the Central Powers weary and war worn find it desirable to negotiate a peace. Then it may be offered as a tempting bait to the Entente Allies to restore and rebuild Belgium, to give up northern France and make compensation for the property destroyed; to let Germany's colonies go to England and Japan in return for concessions to the Central Powers in the Balkan Peninsula and to Turkey along one or more of the eastern routes we have traced and for the confirmation of the more important concessions already made by Russia. Then the Central Powers may well be content for a time to organize their new possessions, to construct their roads to the east and to develop and exploit eastern trade. But when this has been done then again the challenge for world dominion may be thrown down. With increased man power and wealth will go increased chances of winning. The chief opponents would again be Britain and America. They might try the blockade as a means of weakening the Central Powers. But with an inland route to the east they might well laugh at a blockade. On the other hand the Central Powers in the present war have developed their conceptions of sea law. These involve the general conception of war, which permits them to compass the destruction of non-combatants, the law of necessity to cover any particularly barbarous cases not specifically included in the general conception. They have found in their submarines a powerful agent for the destruction of commerce. By means of these they could so infest the highway of the seas that commerce with the east by either canal, Suez or Panama, or by either cape, the Horn or Good Hope, would become very costly, so costly, indeed, that ultimately it would be necessary for Britain and America to give it up. Thus through a virtual blockade by her sub-

*This paragraph took final form later than the body of the paper—some time late in September or early in October, I think.
the wealth and resources of the Central Powers.

marines she might be able to secure the concessions her ambitions require. While for the present the submarine is making the War costly for the Allies, yet their staying qualities are holding up better than those of Germany under the blockade. But under the new conditions supposed this feature of the case might be reversed.

Besides this commercial threat the command of one of these routes would enable the Central Powers to pour armed hordes into India and possibly wrest this country from Britain. Now our strongest bulwark against the Central Powers is the British fleet. But with Britain subdued and India under German control, Germany would have access to the Indian and Pacific oceans. She would be such a factor in these waters as to demand recognition by both Japan and America. Now as Germany has already proposed an alliance with Japan against America, she would probably strive for such an arrangement under the new conditions. It would be foolish on our part, therefore, to favor Germany in her efforts to gain such a stronghold as India, opening the way to the Pacific, where so many of our interests lie.

The effective insurance against this threat is to defeat Germany now. Make her surrender the loot and concessions she forced from Russia. Give to Serbia and Roumania independent positions and collect indemnities from the Central Powers in such amounts as shall be sufficient to deter both rulers and peoples from embarking for a long time to come on another raid on the civilized world for the purpose of plunder and aggrandizement.

THE FREEDOM OF THE SEAS.

The Freedom of the Seas has no significance for a time of peace. It might happen, possibly, that with the winning of the War, the Teutons should decide to interfere seriously with the free navigation of the seas in times of peace. It is not at all certain that they have not made plans for just such a contingency.

The Freedom of the Seas is a war phrase. The German insistence on the Freedom of the Seas is due to the fact that she contemplates a renewal of the struggle for world mastery and does not wish to be hampered a second time by a blockade as she has been throughout the present War. So long as she insists on the Freedom of the Seas, so long will there be evidence that she plans to renew the conflict. A League of Nations that would really enforce peace would do away with any need whatever for the so-called Freedom of the Seas, as this freedom refers only to a state of War.

It seems highly probable that it has been a mistake for our government to permit itself to be identified with Germany on the Freedom of the Seas. Diplomacy makes so many queer moves to the uninitiated that it is hard to say what is behind the government's strenuous insistence on a free sea. But the government will hardly lose any material advantage and will gain a great moral one certainly if it will cut absolutely loose from Germany and drop the Freedom

of the Seas as the special panacea for all the ills humanity organized into states is heir to.

III.

THE FREEDOM OF THE SEAS IN RELATION TO A LEAGUE OF NATIONS TO ENFORCE PEACE.

In his address to Congress, January 8, 1918, President Wilson laid down fourteen essentials of peace. The second of these reads: "Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas outside territorial waters, alike in peace and war, except as the sea may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants." This is the new Freedom of the Seas. It is to be connected with a league of nations to enforce peace. This league is referred to by the president in the fourteenth and last of the essential conditions for a lasting peace. It follows: "A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike." Just what are these "specific covenants" and just how the powers conferred on this league are to be exercised has not appeared. In fact there is no information on the Freedom of the Seas or the league of nations contemplated by the president's peace plan that makes possible an intelligent study of the problems they present.



Four-Minute Talk

Vermilion, August 1, 1918

The German conception of war is in part "a nation in arms." In consequence the German government trained for military service the entire manhood of the nation, secured control over transportation, and over the production of munitions and supplies of all kinds for military operations. The purpose was to be able to strike a blow with the full force of the nation on the instant. In 1859 it required about six weeks to mobilize the small Prussian army alone. In 1914 an army of one and a half millions was assembled and put into action on the French front, to say nothing of the large forces assembled on other fronts, in less than four weeks.

Since the war has been in progress practically every activity that bears on the more efficient conduct of the War or on the ability to prolong it has been placed under government control. Thus Germany now mobilizes the full strength of the nation, not only the manhood, the industrial and financial strength, but all her resources, intellectual and spiritual as well as material, that she may be able to compass the defeat of her enemies. At the beginning of the War it was estimated in some quarters, very optimistically, I think, that Germany was able to raise and support 13,000,000 armed men. But,

on this basis, we should be able to raise an army of more than 22,000,000 million.

In conflict with a nation so organized it is necessary for our government to marshall the full strength of the nation. We are now assembling the striking force. Transportation, food and fuel, the telegraph and the telephone have been placed under government control. Industry, too, has felt government influence. This is no time to have the nation's energies paralyzed by troubles in the industrial world. To lessen the occasion for these the Government has established employment agencies and requests employers and laborers everywhere to register. Employers should not hire one another's help, they should stop poaching and secure their help through the Government agencies. Laborers should secure new jobs in the same way. The purpose is to avoid drawing labor from essential industries and wasting capital in unessential ones. These agencies assist in the necessary readjustment of labor and essential industries. This readjustment must be made if we, like Germany, are to be able to strike with the full force of the nation and maintain the pace. It is necessary if we are to win in the great struggle for humanity and civilization. The Government requests and expects our cordial co-operation.



Four-Minute Talk

Vermilion, August 30, 1918

The Government gives out the information that German propaganda in this country has taken five principal forms: 1. Extreme Industrialism, i. e., this is a war between the proletariat and the capitalistic class; 2. Internationalism, i. e., this is a rich man's war; 3. Racial Prejudices, fomenting disloyalty among the colored people; 4. Religious Pacifism; 5. The Irish Question. In addition there are numerous minor forms of the propaganda designed to embarrass our government. "There are cases on record," says the Government, "where Germans have acted as leaders in Sunday School and Bible classes with the sole intent of sowing dissension among our people by raising religious objections to our part in the defense of freedom and democracy." Slanders against our soldiers across the Atlantic have been spread broadcast. The German government has paid liberally for this propaganda from its reptile fund: \$5,000 to J. F. J. Archibald, \$100,000 or more to Viereck; large sums of Drs. Hale and Rumely. And there are others.

To all stronge stories to the injury of our cause the Government suggests that we oppose at once the definite demand, "Where did you get your facts?" The object is to keep the fighting on the other side of the Atlantic. We want no fire directed on us from the rear while engaging the enemy on our front.

The mighty Ludendorff, with two million men, marched up a hill and then marched down again. Our soldiers helped him get down the hill. The tide is with us now. The Allied army is pressing the Germans back at every point of contact. The Allied soldiers are doing their part nobly. Let us do our part and help our Government to the limit of our strength. Let us stamp out disloyalty and German propaganda whenever and wherever they appear.



An Address to Enlisted Men

The University, September 8, 1918, under the auspices of the Army Y. M. C. A.

Every man has two fatherlands, his own and France. In this way has been expressed the cosmopolitan character of the French, the universal human element dominant in French life. Our hearts are in France. For there are our young men, the choicest specimens of the nation's manhood. They are there upholding the honor of the flag. They are engaged in the great world struggle, fighting for those things we prize most.

The French are a great people, bearing a great and grievous burden with a courage and a heroism worthy of their great past. For centuries the French have been leaders of the world in the very forefront of advancing civilization. There is hardly any modern movement for human betterment, whether in science or philosophy, in morals or government or industry, in which Frenchmen have not taken at least a prominent part, if not the leading one. In some of the most difficult of the arts and sciences they are the recognized leaders of the world today.

It is sometimes implied that the French are characterized by frivolity and dissipation. It is the character of the fast life of Paris, of the demi-monde and its clientele, extended to the French people as a whole. According to trustworthy sources dissipation is more marked in Berlin than in Paris. It is no worse in Paris than in New York or London or any other great city. But it is not true that the French people generally are either frivolous or dissipated. Emotionally the French may be more responsive than either the English or the Americans. Nevertheless the French heart, speaking now of the people generally, is sound to the core. The achievements of the French are not possible to a light-minded and dissipated people. Though devastated and cruelly punished in this war France has not whined. Bled white she has not flinched nor lost courage. Her armies today are setting the world an example of vigorous and aggressive fighting. They still possess the will to win. The French have not boasted, they have not posed, they have not

threatened, they have not complained. When an ally failed in his reasonable support they have borne the added burden without murmuring. They have responded with men and munitions to every call for help. Only a high-spirited and great-souled people could bear up under such strain and maintain their calm and judicial attitude of mind and their undaunted courage. It is unfortunate that differences in customs and language make an appreciation of our great ally difficult for many of us. How well it would be to know their language. It is more important to be able to communicate and fraternize with our friends than with our enemies.

Our hearts are in France. For there is waging the most momentous struggle in all history. The occasion of our entrance into the war was that the German view and practice regarding the Freedom of the Seas was in violent contradiction with our own. The principles and practice in their logical extension would deprive us of the safe commercial use of the ocean, of its safe use at all except possibly for an occasional bathing resort along our coast. The German freedom of the seas was an absolute denial of the freedom of the seas.

But the question at issue is now larger than this. The late James Gordon Bennett, of the New York Herald, is credited with the remark made just after the first battle of the Marne that apparently "the leaders imagined the war to be one of purely political ambitions whereas it was really to be a great struggle between the forces of freedom unorganized but liberal and an autocracy which sought to impose absolute tyranny on the world." This prediction has been amply justified. Whatever the occasion of our entrance into the war or that of any of our allies the conflict has finally resolved itself into a struggle between government by Divine right, or autocratic government, and government by the consent of the governed, or popular or free government, in which the latter is fighting for its very existence. We must win or we must pass under the yoke and yield up rights and privileges which make us a free and independent nation.

The German autocracy aspires to world power and world domination. The plans have been deeply laid. For nearly two generations the German autocracy has been preparing the German people for just such a struggle as the present one. It has taught a philosophy of state and of morals especially adapted to the needs of a government by Divine right with aggression in mind. In this theory of the state might makes right. The weaker state has no rights that the stronger may not disregard when it is to his advantage to do so. Treaties are "scraps of paper." They cease to have binding force the moment they fail to yield advantages satisfactory to the stronger contracting power. It is right to corrupt the citizens of a friendly state, to foment industrial troubles and to incite to crime and insurrection so long and so far as this sort of thing is not effectively resented. It is right that the ships of a friendly power be "Spurlos

Versenkt," provided it will ease an embarrassing diplomatic situation. In all these cases the power to do these infamous things confers the right to do them.

The state is the expression or embodiment of the highest power in organized society. Therefore, whatever the state does or directs, and the autocracy is the state, is right. The citizens need draw back from an infamy or autocracy provided only it has been authorized or directed by the proper representative of the state. That it has been so directed makes it morally right.

In this theory the state is also the highest ideal of society. Consequently, it is the highest duty of the citizen to serve the state. The greater the service to the state by its citizens, the higher in the scale of their development is their civilization. The Germans surpass all other peoples in their service and devotion to the state. Therefore, they stand above, and apart from, all other peoples in culture and civilization. They are the chosen people, the elect, the supermen. They are to dominate the nations of the earth. In the great organization or empire through which this domination is to be exercised, and this organization has been much in the German mind, only those of German blood and speech are to have the rights of citizens. The subject races or nationalities must serve the needs and pleasure of the superior race, pampering their German conquerors and lawgivers. Their own aims and ambitions must be abandoned. They must minister to the power and, therefore, necessarily cause to increase the arrogance of their German overlords. But this latter fact does not appeal to the Teuton as an objection at all to his theory but to a subject race, to an inferior people, to an American, for example, it might seem to be a most serious objection.

This theory is in accord with the law of the survival of the fittest in the struggle for existence, a struggle in which pity and mercy have no place. It is the doctrine of the bloody tooth and claw. It is a biological law from the theory of natural selection transferred without modification to international relations. Power is the central thing. Whether the power is won openly and honorably or by deceit and treachery is a matter of indifference. In either case the power gained increases the chances for survival in the struggle for existence. Further, this power throws over actions of whatever character, however abominable, the mantle and sanctity of right. It is, therefore, the positive duty of the state to increase its power by every means at hand. In thus increasing its power it may disregard the rights and privileges of other nations without mercy and without compunction. Toward other nations and other peoples the German is as ruthless as toward the unprotected voyager on the sea.

The German theory of war is in harmony with this theory of state. With most nations war is primarily a conflict between the armed forces of two states, a concept which gives a basis for a good deal of humanity in the treatment of the private citizens of the enemy. But with the German war is all this and more. War has

for its object to destroy the material and spiritual power of the enemy by every means that works effectively to that end. One of these is to wage war relentlessly on private, unarmed citizens, to slay or reduce them to slavery or worse, confiscate or destroy their property. The harsher the treatment the better, for the sooner will their spirit be broken and their material resources exhausted. This theory of war involves also the law of necessity to justify any particularly abhorrent barbarities not specifically covered by the general theory. Under this law the Germans may violate a flag of truce if such action will save their precious skins. Wells may be poisoned, women and children murdered, hospitals raided with bombs and machine guns, hospital ships may be sunk, all under the sacred shield of this so-called law of necessity. The atrocities in Belgium and France were no surprise to those acquainted with the German theory of war.

After having declared in the heyday of his success that there is no international law, because there is no power able to enforce it against Germany, and having disregarded and violated it on land and sea and in the air the German emperor now loudly complains to the world that the dropping of bombs on the cities of the Rhine valley, where poison gas for military use is manufactured, is a gross violation of international law. For it is an interference with his power to violate that law. This seems to us childish or imbecile. But it is not so. This same theory of selection which covers his theory of state and morals provides a defense for the weak in "protective coloration." The German emperor is simply using this device. He is appearing to be something he is not. He was using it when he protested to Spain against her wickedness in taking over German ships to replace the Spanish vessels unlawfully sunk by German submarines. He believes when all things are going well with his army that the more powerful nation should survive and rule the less powerful. But should he be beaten in this war, as he surely will be, then he will make the most abject renunciation of his theory of state and his aims of conquest, pour forth a host of pious platitudes which will make the Sermon on the Mount seem stale and vapid, and plead for mercy and an honored place beside the victors. His theory of state requires it. It is protective coloration. If the military terms please you better you may call it camouflage.

There is no passion in this analysis nor any implication that this theory is held by every individual German, nor that it makes any difference in this connection what the individual German believes. We have little sympathy with that form of dementia which declines to face the ugly facts because here and there happens to be a German with no influence whatever on the trend of events, who does not adopt the prevailing mode of thought. The theory given is that of the dominant class, of those who determine German policy, abundantly confirmed by their literature and their conduct

of the war. It is to this theory or to the class holding it that President Wilson, after three years of fruitless and devious negotiations refers with almost infinite disgust as this "intolerable thing." It is this theory or "this intolerable thing" with which we must reckon in this war and in the peace negotiations which are to terminate the war.

The German theory of state based on the survival of the fittest requires in the German mind, of course, world power and world dominion for the German autocracy, for government by Divine right. To this theory government by the consent of the governed is an offense, as smoke to the eyes or as vinegar to the teeth. It undermines and destroys the very foundations of autocratic government. Where not under compulsion peoples have almost uniformly chosen some form of popular government in preference to autocratic government. To gain world dominion the autocracy must consequently humiliate and weaken or destroy the most conspicuous and powerful representative of popular government. We are in this war fighting, therefore, for our very existence as a free and independent nation. And it is for us to see that government by the consent of the governed shall not be effaced from the earth. In doing this we shall help France and Britain and Italy and all our allies, as a matter of course. But we may be modest about it and remember that we have as much at stake as they. They have already done more to protect us and the cause of freedom than in all probability we shall have opportunity in this war to repay by service in kind to them.

It is necessary to beat the German and beat him decisively. He has appealed to force or might as bearing his rights in the case. It is force and force only that will prove to him that the Almighty has not called him just yet to administer all the affairs of this old world of ours. A negotiated peace would only shift the duty and the burden to the next generation. This would be a cowardly evasion of moral obligation on our part. In the nature of the case there can be no real peace except a dictated peace.

There is no question as to the character or efficiency of the American soldier. Like the French he does not boast, he does not pose, he does not complain or whine. If the order is to go over the top, he goes over the top; if it is to hold his ground, he holds it. There is no need to admonish him to cherish and exemplify the principles of righteousness which he imbibed in his earliest childhood, even at his mother's breast. The nations have every confidence in the American soldier.

The real question is for us at home to give him the moral and material support worthy of the cause, a support without which he cannot win. Every man and every dollar, if needs be, must go into that support. According to government reports there are some at home who unfortunately, like Faustus, have sold their souls to the Devil, directly or indirectly and are attempting by a subtle propaganda to undermine and annul the work our soldiers are accom-

plishing across the Atlantic. The duty rests on us at home to suppress this stuff and those who originate and scatter it. It must not be permitted that the sacrifices our soldiers are making shall have been made in vain and all this because of the poison of propaganda at home.

Our hearts are in France. For there trembling in the balance is the fate of government by the consent of the governed, the highest conception of government reached by our race in its long and eventful history. There in the balance, too, is what is highest and best in our civilization. For with the autocratic theory of government is associated a civilization distinct from the Christian. The fate of humanity is involved. The struggle will determine which of two widely divergent paths the race will henceforth follow. Those who strive to save those things men most cherish are worthy of all honor. Those who fall go down in the noblest cause for which men may make the supreme sacrifice. To engage in such a struggle is a rare opportunity. It is not given to every man nor to every generation. It reveals to the individual man a larger and a nobler self. Five minutes in battle develops more character, more power, more real manhood than a cycle of Cathay. The soldier's is a fiery ordeal, but it changes the baser metals into purest gold and transforms the timid lad into hero stuff and blazons his name alongside the immortals of history. For the clean and open minded youth it develops self control, broadens and deepens his sense of duty, purifies and ennobles his devotion to country and to humanity and enlarges his conception of the range and possibilities of life. True it is a costly school, but it is the oldest, as old as the race, and in some respects is unsurpassed.

Shall those who have borne the battle be forgotten, will they pass into oblivion at the end of the war? Has Leonidas been forgotten or his Spartan band? High above the waters on the rugged peaks that look down on Thermopylae where lie Spartan band and Persian dead the fire still glows to point the world to heroic sacrifice for freedom and for country. Its light pierces the gloom wherever the heart of man mirrors back the heart of God. For twenty-five centuries its light has illumined the noble but arduous path of duty and sacrifice and its radiance is still undimmed. Certainly, he had seen its light and felt its glow of whom the poilus in their trench journal have this tribute:

"Cypress nor yew shall weave for him their shade;
Cypress nor yew shall shield his quiet sleep;
Marble must crack, and graven names must fade—
He for his tomb has won the changeless deep.
We mortals bring our transient gifts,
Fast-fading flowers, as garlands for his fame;
But 'tis the tempest and the thunderous drift
That to eternity shall sound his name."

No, Leonidas and his Spartan band did not die. On the contrary the tale of years for them has been multiplied ten thousand times and their lives have been, and are to be, lived over and over again in millions and millions of human hearts. Though they knew it not, they drank at the fountain of eternal youth.

So it always has been and so it always will be. Earthly immortality is the meed of honor awarded those who in great and abounding measure have sacrificed or achieved for humanity. So the names and deeds of those who engage in the present mighty struggle will be flashed down the coming ages from generation to generation as long as the earth shall circle the sun. The peoples and nations which have been rescued from impending ruin, whose destinies have been cleared from the dark and lowering clouds which overhung, will delight to heap honors on the veterans of the World War and shower them with evidences of deep and lasting gratitude. Members of the National Army and of the American Expeditionary Force, the unborn generations, the millions and myriads yet to be, salute you.



Four-Minute Talk

Vermillion, September 27, 1918

Beware of peace drives. A peace drive proceeded the downfall of Russia; one the great disaster to the Italian army. A strong peace drive made possible the two great dents in the allied line in France in the Spring and early Summer. Now that her army is clearly over-matched Germany is seeking to organize the mushy peace sentiment in the Allied countries in order that she may retain through diplomacy the swag and loot and plunder and booty her army has gathered in but is no longer able to hold. Beware of peace drives.

Everything is at stake in war is the judgment of Bernhardt, the German military writer and expert. Nations sometimes neglect the time economy of forces and bring them to bear on the enemy in small groups and successively. France in 1870 is the standard example of this. She first sent in her best troops. They were outnumbered overwhelmingly and beaten. She then sent in her second class troops to go down in defeat in like fashion. At the last her old men and young boys were brought into the hopeless struggle against a superior force. In 1900 General Foch, then a colonel, said we must make use of all our forces of whatever kind and bring them to bear in mutual support on the enemy.

We must heed this lesson of history and marshal all our forces at the earliest possible day and bring them to bear at one and the same time on the enemy. This will cost great effort and an immense

sum of money. A twenty-four drive on a ten-mile front represent an investment of fifty-four million in artillery and ammunition alone. We must make many such drives. We are practically committed to seven billion for artillery and ammunition. We need five billion to complete our shipping program. The bill for food and clothing and small arms and ammunition and pay and insurance for our soldiers must be added. And for an army of five million which we are soon to have, this bill becomes enormous. But these things are necessary if we are to make our full power felt by the enemy.

The Fourth Liberty Loan is to enable our Government to carry out this program. It is not necessary to urge this loyal and patriotic audience to support the Government. We shall do it as a matter of course. Our soldiers and our Allies in France, our Allies in the Balkans and in Palestine have clearly shown that the war can be won and are making the necessary sacrifices. Let us bear our part and give them all the support we can.



Britain and the War*

The roar of battle has died away. A stillness as of peace has fallen on warring lands. It was a stupendous struggle. Its magnitude paralyzes imagination and leaves us cold and unmoved. Fifty-six million men, if we may believe the reports at hand, were marshalled for the fighting. The casualties number twenty-six million. Eleven million† laid down their lives. The money cost was two hundred and twenty-one billion. These sacrifices in men and money, sacrifices which stand alone in history, were made to decide whether the world should be bond or free.

I.

ISSUES INVOLVED.

Germany put forward a claim for "a place in the sun." At first this appeared to many to mean only more commercial privileges and the question of an additional port or two. But it was not long until the far reaching and sinister character of this claim was apparent to every one. It meant at least a Central European Empire, extending from the North Sea to the Sea of Marmora and the Bosphorus. It was to include Belgium and northern France so far as to embrace the great coal and iron mines of this region. So surrounded Holland would be practically unable to carry out any strictly independent, international policy and would become to all intents and purposes a province in this Central European Empire.

*Prepared while in the St. Vincent Hospital, Sioux City, Dec. 4-9, 1918.

†A more recent and conservative estimate is nine million, which still seems to bear a very high ratio to the total number in arms.

This empire was to include Livonia and other Russian provinces on the eastern shore of the Baltic. Ukraine and Russian Poland, too, were to be absorbed, thus taking the most important manufacturing and the richest agricultural districts in Russia. Roumania might accept absorption peaceably with a little sop thrown in to ease her pride. It was hoped she would accept. Or she might attempt the role of Serbia and repeat her experience. Greece and Bulgaria had already been induced to accommodate themselves gracefully to the idea of German overlordship and were expected at the proper time to play the preassigned role. Turkey, too, was in the partnership. This combination was thus assured the control of the littoral of the eastern Adriatic, the Aegean, the straits of Dardenelles and of Bosphorus, and the Black sea. If Italy had not repudiated her acquiescent attitude toward the Triple Alliance, the combination would have controlled the shores of the northern and eastern Mediterranean from Genoa to Suez.

It was hoped to induce Spain to adopt an aggressively friendly attitude toward this combination. Gibraltar was to be her reward. With so much accomplished the Mediterranean had passed far along the stages making it a German lake, as in their mind's eye the Baltic had already become. But plainly German ambitions did not stop at this point. Turkey was expected to assert control over Egypt and take physical possession of the Suez canal. With all these things realized the Mediterranean with its immense trade would have become practically an inland sea for the Central European Empire and a closed sea for the rest of the world.

Further, Turkey was to gain control over the northern and western shore of the Persian Gulf and, in fact, over the entire Arabian peninsula. So extended and developed the Central Empire and its satellites formed one organized body stretching from the North sea to the Persian Gulf and the Indian ocean. With Gibraltar and Suez taken from Britain India became like ripe fruit ready to fall into the lap of Germany the moment the tree was shaken.

These are a minimum of Germany's territorial ambitions at the beginning of the War. But such an expansion of territory and increase of power would carry with them important consequences. The imponderables have to be considered in such a case. The completion of such a scheme would have so weakened France that she might henceforth be ignored in the international world. Her colonies could be taken over at leisure. The surrender of Suez and Gibraltar by Britain would imply that she had first been reduced to impotence. For no one enters a strong man's house and takes possession of his goods without the precaution of first binding the strong man. The partitioning of Russia presupposes her effacement as a first class power. Thus the Central European Empire would be assured the hegemony of Europe not merely in the sense of predominating in her councils but as actually dominating the European situation to the extent that every nation of Europe must accept German dictation. Thus into the balance in favor of any policy

she might adopt the Central European Empire would be able to throw the immense wealth and resources of Europe and Western Asia. Outside Europe there are but two nations to be considered for a moment in relation to this Central Empire; namely, Japan and the United States. But against such a combination as this either alone or both allied would be powerless. They, too, must submit to German domination and dictation. Thus the establishment of the Central European Empire with its embellishments would give to Germany the first goal of her ambition, that of world domination. World dominion would then easily and naturally follow. Thus world domination and world dominion, as became painfully apparent early in the War, were the real objectives of the struggle.

But in addition the cry of Kultur was heard. German science, German philosophy, German literature, German organization were all acclaimed as far superior to those of other peoples. The cheerful conclusion was drawn, on the basis of the theory of the survival of the fittest, not that these results of the activities of the German people would survive over those of other peoples, but that the German people themselves were to displace the less highly cultured peoples, destroying or in certain cases enslaving them. The American people have sometimes been accused of boastfulness. Our enthusiastic countryman who bounded the United States on the north by the Aurora Borealis, on the east by the rising sun, on the south by the vernal equinox and on the west by the Day of Judgment, has been admittedly in the more conservative American circles, guilty of a slight exaggeration. But American exaggeration at its best has the saving quality, or salinity, of humor. But no touch of conscious humor, though the situation has a quality all its own, lightened the ponderous preachings of the Germans on their superior gifts and attainments as a people. They were the solemn ambassadors of Kultur or of Odin, proclaiming a new world order.

The German Kultur has developed a theory or state and or international morals in sharp contrast with the conceptions of the modern civilized world generally. So markedly did the fundamental moral concepts differ from those of Christian civilization as to justify the observation that the German was developing a new civilization, distinct from the Christian, a civilization in which pity and mercy have no place outside the family or clan, and in which the brotherhood of man has been replaced by the doctrine of the bloody tooth and claw, a civilization that would make its highest ideals those of Odin's Valhalla.

Obsessed with the notion of the holiness of these ideals and with that of the greatness of the German people Germany fully armed and prepared broke like a beast of prey from cover on the startled and unprepared nations of the world. Everything she desired seemed to be within her grasp. Her army rushed through Belgium and France, marking the way with destruction

and devastation. By a miracle the French armies held along the Marne and the devouring beast recoiled on his haunches by the Aisne. This was his first taste of real delay or defeat. His momentary hesitation gave a much needed respite for preparation against him. Then the attack along the eastern front began in earnest and a Russian army was enmeshed and destroyed among the Masurian lakes. And again the road to his goal seemed to lie open before him.

II.

BRITAIN'S PART IN THE STRUGGLE.

The only force which seemed to be ready for the crisis in an adequate way was Britain's fleet. Her ships rode the seas as proudly as in times of peace. At the first signs of war the fighting ships took their stations and hemmed in the opposing fleets. In thirty-six hours after the declaration of war German commerce on the sea had practically ceased to be. Britain's swift cruisers began the search for German commerce destroyers. These were promptly gathered in, except an occasional destroyer that succeeded in eluding the blockading fleets. The German fleet in Asiatic waters was active. But after four months of war no organized German fighting force was afloat on the high seas.

From the beginning the British fleet exerted a steady pressure on the Central Powers, hampering and hindering their efforts to get supplies from abroad. In this work the effectiveness of the fleet was somewhat reduced by the action and attitude of neutrals. The declaration of London, adopted by the Naval Congress of 1909, had been boldly proclaimed by Germany's representatives as her war program against Britain. On the outbreak of the war Germany asked our Government to press Britain to pledge the observance of the Declaration of London in naval warfare. This Declaration Britain had never approved. This service to Germany—and we tell it without the slightest feeling of pride—our Government seemed to be really glad to render.

We made trouble over the examination of mails and yet search revealed that our mail bags were filled with contraband. There is no more universally recognized principle of international law than that which forbids to a government unneutral service. And yet our law officers contended that the principle was of none effect provided only that the unneutral service were rendered through the agency of the mails. This contention Britain and her allies did not accept. But they lessened the efficiency of the blockade in order that our Government might not be too greatly offended by their failure to accede to her wholly untenable propositions.

Then came the submarine warfare, Germany declaring a war zone round the British Isles. She threatened and proceeded to carry out her threat to sink neutral vessels without warning and

without provision for the safety of passengers when these vessels were found in the war zone. There is nothing like it in all international law, ancient or modern. In meditated cruelty against the innocent it is without parallel. Our protests against these outrages were wordy, but were always presented to our dear, good friend Germany with whom we had long stood in a common effort to obtain the Freedom of the seas, and with whom we are still standing in her struggle for this freedom. In retaliation against the war-zone proclamation by Germany Britain and her Allies adopted an absolute blockade of the Central Powers, closing all access to or egress from, whether directly or indirectly for commerce of every kind. This action, based on retaliation, was in international law a perfectly legitimate step. Our Government, however, entered a vigorous protest against this action. But the Allies held their ground and gradually our Government ceased to enter complaint. Since we entered the War our Government has enthusiastically supported the absolute blockade of the Central Powers. In fact, the blockade was not only good law, but also good sense. It was enforced without cruelty and without needless inconvenience to neutrals.

Thus it was substantially Britain's fleet that kept the high ways of the seas open to Allied and neutral commerce and closed them absolutely against commerce with the Central Powers. This fact had much to do with the ultimate decision of the struggle.

The German battle fleet was engaged off Jutland, May 31, 1916. The German emperor proclaimed the result a wonderful victory for his fleet. But we know now, and rather more than suspected it then, that the result was a crushing defeat for the Germans, their battle fleet barely escaping annihilation under the shield of thick weather, their naval aspirations for the period of the war perishing off Jutland. Only "low visibility" enabled a battered remnant of that fleet to cripple into port the next day. The protection of this port it never afterwards left as a fighting force. Many of its ships were dismantled and disarmed to furnish material for the construction and armament of submarines.

We know also how bravely and determinedly the British fleet dealt with the submarine menace. True, there was a regrettable loss of life and enormous losses in vessels and commerce due to submarine activity. While the submarine for a time constituted a very real and serious danger it was ultimately held primarily by the fleets and shipyards of Britain. While our own fleet did excellent service, yet according to Admiral Sims, our destroyers did not number more than three per cent of the force engaged in battling the submarine. Britain's fleets were never off duty, were always active and alert and did the work with unflinching courage and determination.

We must note other contributions by Britain. In France she shortly replaced "the contemptible, little army," (in passing, the

finest fighting force in Europe), by a well organized and equipped army of two million men. Under Haig this army forced Germany to abandon the Verdun campaign and gave the German soldier the first real taste of defeat. It was the beginning of the long process of sapping and undermining his morale. So long as victory resolutely perches on his banner the morale of the German soldier is superb; but under a long and sustained series of defeats he has not the staying quality of either the British or the French soldier. With the tide against him "Kamerad" is the easiest word Fritz's lips can find. And Fritz's morale was sadly frayed and raveled at the edges under Foch's sledge hammer blows with the British, French and American armies. While he had not collapsed yet he was in a devoutly thankful frame of mind when he found that his government would no longer sustain the War.

British soldiers shared in the illstarred expedition against Gallipoli and added to their reputation for courage, endurance and heroism. They did their full share of the fighting in the Balkan peninsula. They subdued insurrection in Egypt and kept order among the tribes far out in the desert border regions under a tropical sun. They defended the Suez canal and pushed an expedition along the Sinaitic peninsula, finally crossing these waterless sands into Palestine and winning from the cruel and brutish administration of the Turk that ancient land whose hills still re-echo the aspirations, voiced in song and prophecy, of a gifted race long since scattered among strange and unfriendly peoples.

Undaunted by the failure in Mesopotamia and Townsend's surrender at Kut a reorganized British army under Maude fought its way up the Tigris and captured Bagdad, the goal of the original expedition. Here the army sat on, and crushed the life out of, the German hope of a Berlin to Bagdad road that was to terminate at some point on the Persian Gulf, constituting a threat against India, and of that modified road from Berlin to Bagdad and thence along the old caravan routes through Persia to some point within striking distance of the borders of China and India. From the region of the Tigris valley a British force crossed Persia and took Batum on the Caspian in the closing year of the War. Though unable to hold Batum this force made it valueless to the enemy by destroying the oil wells there, the richest, perhaps, in the world, yielding about one-fifth of the world's total annual output of oil. A British force from India traversed the desert regions of Afghanistan and entered Bokhara in Turkestan and there made wreck of a fine new German dream whose iridescent colors had charmed the Teuton imagination since the fall of Bagdad, a dream which rejoiced in the cheerfully alliterative description of "the Berlin to Bokhara" route to the east, to China and India. With equal fortitude the British soldier bore himself in the work of suppressing insurrection in India, rebellion in Ireland and in compassing the defeat of the Germans in eastern and southwestern Africa.

Thanks mainly to the British soldier and sailor the German flag floats over no colonial or island possession, save possibly Heligoland. We say thanks, for that flag represented in the War the agencies at enmity with humanity and free government. The German administration in colonial Africa gives but a saddening and sickening story of lust and cruelty. Let us not think that the overthrow of German authority in her colonies was accomplished without great sacrifice. It was an added effort to one already reaching close to the limit of Britain's strength. Seven of every eight of her men of military age, and the age limit was raised to fifty years, saw service with the army or the fleet. The British women went into the munition factories and kept their brothers on the fighting line supplied with the means of carrying on the struggle. They stepped into the places left vacant by the men and kept the machinery of production and distribution going, filling the channels of domestic trade with the products of their labor. These women have shared in the responsibility of winning this war for humanity and civilization and must now share the honor.

Britain's financial strength was an important factor in bringing the War to a satisfactory conclusion. It was her millions which for a long time paid for the munitions and supplies for some of the Allied armies and peoples. An estimate places her war expenses at \$41,500,000,000, more than double our own. Financially Germany had an advantage, a compensatory advantage, in that she was cut off from neutral trade. She could contract no debts outside her own dominions. She was able to carry on the War, consequently, by means of paper currency, forced loans and other financial methods which would have broken down completely outside her own realm. But Britain had to face obligations to the neutral world with no thought or possibility of repudiation.

As an example of British courage and devotion among a multitude of possible cases the first battle of Ypres may be mentioned. There in 1914 the German hosts pressed fiercely in their determined rush for the Channel ports. These hosts were magnificently armed, furnished with all the heavy guns and supplies they could use. Opposed to them at first was barely one-fifth of their number of British soldiers, some of these volunteers and not rated as first line troops, inadequately supplied with artillery. Toward the close of the long struggle, for it lasted three weeks, the British had increased their number through re-enforcements to nearly one-third the number of the enemy opposed to them. Yet the British held the line. True it was at an awful sacrifice. Of 400 officers in one division, Rawlinson's on leaving England only 44 remained at the end of the struggle. of the 12,000 men, only 2,236 were left. The brigade under Gen. Fitzclarence, the normal strength of which was 153 officers and 5,000 men was reduced to eight officers and 500 men. But it was British devotion and dogged determination that stopped the rush. Had the soldiers failed to hold, the chances are that the story of

the War would have had an entirely different ending. As an example of unflinching courage, of a determination to hold the line and pay the cost, cost what it might, there is hardly anything finer in history. The Roman who thrust his hand into the fire to show Pyrrhus that Romans could suffer as well as perform deeds of daring, reveals nothing better in metal and courage than these soldiers in the ranks drawn from the reddest blood of Britain, who deliberately sacrificed themselves in an unequal contest in order to block the German rush and give civilization time for the preparation of an adequate army of defence. For this was primarily a soldier's battle. Little as the world can afford to lose such men, the verdict of history will justify without a doubt the sacrifice they deemed it their duty to make at Ypres.

That Britain was fighting to avoid dismemberment and thus had a direct interest in the outcome of the War there is no occasion to deny. But self interest in such a case carries with it no disparagement. It is self interest in no narrow or selfish sense. Although the opportunity for the loftiest altruism in its absolute purity was denied them yet at the same time that Britons were fighting for their existence as a nation they were contending for the ideals and fundamentals of modern Christian civilization. They were fighting for humanity and for those conceptions which make free and popular government possible. But for Britain's sons in arms on land and on sea the hosts from the north bearing with them the philosophy of might and the ideals of Odin's warriors would have borne down all apposition and established themselves supreme in Europe and, consequently, also in the world. They would have established everywhere autocratic government, government by Divine right. If apparent exceptions were made they would involve the payment of tribute and the acknowledgment of inferiority for the privilege of existence.

And so Britain's achievements in this War have been for that abstraction we call freedom, freedom as manifested in free government, for those sentiments and for that attitude of mind and heart and for that conduct toward others which we summarize under the one word humanity, for that civilization whatever the sources of its various elements and ideals which we characterize as Christian. In Flanders fields where poppies blow between the crosses, row on row, her dead sons shall sleep, for Britain has kept faith with them, has caught the torch thrown from falling hands and held it high.

Roosevelt*

A Tribute.

A strong man has passed away. What is to be his place in history? How will he stand in comparison with his fellow men? What permanent contribution has he made to the cause of humanity for which the world will be unwilling to forget him?

He was a man of marvelous energy. John Morley said that he had seen in America the Niagara Falls and Mr. Roosevelt. Twelve long columns in the Readers' Guide are devoted to listing articles by and about Roosevelt for the years 1910 to 1914, more space to this private citizen than was given in the same period to the two men who followed him in the presidential office. He made his mark as a naturalist, an explorer, a literary man, a historian, a politician, a social reformer, a statesman, and a citizen. Forty volumes, it is said, bear witness to his activity with his pen. He will be ranked easily as the most versatile of our presidents, of the first twenty-eight.

He will stand well as an executive. His administration saw the adoption of some measures embodying important principles for which he stood. The Forest Reserve Act and the National Irrigation Act both assume that the public domain and its wealth belong, not to certain favored corporations, but to the people as a whole and are to be developed for their benefit. The Employer's Liability Law, first declared unconstitutional and then in a modified form re-enacted, shows his attitude toward labor. Suits were instituted against Harri-man, the Tobacco and the Standard Oil Trusts to compel compliance with the law. He forced the arbitration of the Anthracite coal strike, emphasizing again that the public welfare stands above private or corporate interests. One of his great achievements, says an unfriendly critic, was the reformation of business morality brought about by his storming assaults on rooted evils. The values of these things is to be estimated not so much by what was actually accomplished as by what was inaugurated. Since his administration there has been a well grounded sentiment among the people that corporations, however strong, may be compelled to have regard for the public welfare, whether they choose or not. He showed that there were teeth in the Sherman anti-trust law, teeth pulled by a succeeding administration. "During his administration," says an organ of his political opponents "the soul of the United States was stirred as never before in time of peace and there was laid the solid foundation for the structure of social and economic progress whose towering height is now the beacon to all other nations." For his work in paving the foundations for business morality and for social

*A talk at the Memorial Service for Roosevelt held at the City Hall, Vermilion, February 9, 1919. The topics assigned the several speakers were Roosevelt's Achievements, Roosevelt as a Politician, Roosevelt as a Reformer, Roosevelt's Place in History. The last of these is considered under the above title.

and economic progress history will accord him, I believe, an honored place among those who have been benefactors of their fellow men.

He is entitled to a high place as a master of statecraft, not, perhaps, of that tortuous and elusive thing called diplomacy, but of that nobler skill which pilots the ship of state across a dangerous sea without the voyagers becoming conscious of the risks, a manifestation of that wisdom nine-tenths of which in his own phrasing consists in being wise in time. There were abundant opportunities for trouble with foreign nations. It was his merit to foresee and to prevent or avoid. As examples consider the Alaskan Boundary dispute, the difficulties between Japan and California, the checking of German ambitions in Venezuela, his part in bringing about peace between Japan and Russia and his activities in connection with the Algeciras Conference, which probably resulted in the avoidance of a world war in 1905. When the full significance of the Panama canal for our national policy and for the commerce of the world becomes apparent, as it certainly will in the not distant future, his energy and foresight and wisdom in bringing about the construction of that great water way will receive much wider recognition than at present.

In the recent great conflict to make the world safe for democracy, democracy won on the battle field. Is democracy to be a dominant element of government and civilization for the future? How far a thorough going democracy is consistent with a league of nations to enforce peace, wherein is lodged the power to employ the armed forces, or other forces, of a nation for a purpose or purposes directly opposed to the will of the people of that nation I am not now disposed to discuss nor do I pretend to any competence in such matters. But I shall assume that the sober judgment of the Peace Conferees will not lead them to shackle or sacrifice democracy, the major objective of the war, to assure the success of any subsidiary or secondary object such as the formation of a league to insure peace. The Conference might fail to form a league of nations to enforce peace and yet make the world safe for democracy; and it might form a league of nations to enforce peace and at the same time bind democracy to a body of death. I am pointing out that the two things are separable in thought and, conceivably, in practice; though recent press reports might lead us to believe that the two things are identical. Not until the structure of the peace plan is completed will there be ground for an independent judgment on the way democracy has fared at the Peace Conference and a satisfactory basis for predictions as to the future.

There is unrest in Europe and America, voiced by socialists, Bolshevik and others. Whether it bode well or ill for humanity, this unrest can hardly be interpreted otherwise than as an aspiration of the mass of the people for a larger share in the affairs of government; possibly, too, in the wealth of the world. In view of these

things a forecast as to the future of democracy presents obvious difficulties. But this is certainly the day of democracy ascendant; and we shall assume in view of what has been presented or in spite of it that it is the day of democracy triumphant. We shall take it for granted that henceforth democracy is to characterize both government and civilization.

Now Roosevelt did not discover democracy nor did he invent it. But he was the active source and agent of a movement in this country making for democracy. In his address before the Ohio Constitutional Convention he said: "I believe in a pure democracy. With Lincoln I hold that this country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it." In fact the whole address is concerned primarily with the adjustment of the machinery of government so that it may respond directly to the will of the people. His influence while on the Civil Service Commission and his preachings throughout his administration and later served to arouse in the voter a real sense of his power over governmental affairs. This consciousness of the voter has been the most potent factor in our recent political history. It is the rock on which the administration of his successor was wrecked, as well as the hopes of that successor for a second term. At the last election several small boats occupied by national representatives who had preferred the voice of propaganda to that of the American people smashed against that rock and went down. A Congressional committee is now investigating that sad accident and sagely considering measure by which that obstruction may be removed from the channel through which some Congressmen are sure to want to sail. The life of a representative will be hard, indeed, if his constituency is to hold him to the serious business of government. This attitude of the voter is the most insistent thing the present administration has had to deal with; and it will have to deal with this insistent attitude through every remaining hour of its existence. The tendency will be for this insistence on the part of the voter to increase rather than to diminish. It is to form an important phase of our political activity for the future. History will record that to Roosevelt more than to any other man of his time or to any other force was due the awakening of this latent consciousness of power in the voter and its wise direction. It is the power on which the existence of any real democracy depends. It is a contribution of the first order to our social and political life; and history, I believe, will so esteem it.

At his death friend and political foe alike seemed to think most fitting for his epitaph: Roosevelt, the American. They emphasized his sterling patriotism. His staunch Americanism during the last four years towered above all else in his long and eventful public career. He advocated preparedness when the administration was against him and apparently was carrying public opinion with it. This was Roosevelt the patriot, not Roosevelt the politician; for the politician swims with the current. When the country was about to

enter the war Roosevelt offered his services in a military capacity. This offer was curtly declined. Deeply hurt he did not sulk, however, but selecting apparently the most difficult and disagreeable work open to the private citizen he put forth all his energy to the task of making the vigorous and successful prosecution of the war easy for the administration. True he criticised, but it was for delay and vacillation. He was far and away the strongest single force in the country supporting the administration in the war.

He grappled with the problems presented by our citizenship of foreign origin as possibly influenced or swayed by certain enemy organizations planted on our soil. No other man would have selected these problems for his special field. The country, he said, wanted no fifty-fifty loyalty. He advanced further and declared that the citizen who is not one hundred per cent American is not an American at all. The country, he emphasized, demanded undivided loyalty insisted that our language must be English. We must have one language. He saw clearly that the nation can not endure half American and half polyglot. It is written throughout history from the building of the tower of Babel down to the collapse of Austria-Hungary. His propositions are true, eternally true. He that sits in the Heavens and laughs to scorn the mightiest of the earth made them so. And yet no politician or office seeker would have his name associated with them for one moment. I need not say why. It was not Roosevelt the politician speaking. It was Roosevelt the patriot, the American. Forgetful of his personal fortunes and holding the truth before him in clear vision, with the austerity of a prophet of old, he was as a voice crying, Make the Paths Straight or this nation can not endure as a free people.

John Wesley did not invent religion, but he was a living religious force. He is still a religious force. Roosevelt did not invent democracy, or patriotism or Americanism nor did he originate the Ten Commandments; but he was a living force making for democracy, for patriotism, for Americanism and for public and private morality. He will continue to be a force making for these things. His figure, I believe, is destined to loom far larger in the future than in the present.

You do not worship any man nor do I. But I would that every American inspired by the example of the man to whom we pay tribute tonight might raise his hand to heaven and record the vow henceforth to serve his country with a stronger, purer, nobler and more unselfish devotion than hitherto.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 015 845 507 9

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 015 845 507 9